

THE SPIRIT OF BUDDHISM.

THE Spirit of Buddhism

**BEING AN
EXAMINATION-ANALYTICAL-EXPLANATORY
AND CRITICAL**

OF

**The life of the founder of Buddhism: His religion and
philosophy, its influence upon other religions, philosophies
and on the ancient and modern social and
ethical systems, social upheavals and
revolutionary movements.**

By

Sir HARI SINGH GOUR,

M.A., D.Litt., D.C.L., L.L.D., M.L.A.

LONDON:

LUZAC and CO.,

46, Great Russel Street, W. C.

1929.

Printed at
Lal Chand & Sons,
76, Lower Circular Road,
Calcutta.

PREFACE

This work calls for a word of explanation. Its subject has given rise to a voluminous literature in all the principal European languages. But all these works have been written by European scholars. It appeared to the present writer that there might still be room for a work compiled by one who, though not an orientalist, had yet lived in a system out of which Buddhism had grown and who, by reason of his remote kinship with the Great Master, might perhaps possess a mentality which may give him in some small degree an advantage denied to alien writers, brought up under a different system and possessing a mentality, which has to be trained to the receptivity of ideas and the appreciation of a doctrine, the elements of which are familiar to all Hindus, and the depth of which can perhaps be more easily sounded by those to whose forefathers the doctrine was at first preached and who, by their love and devotion to their great compatriot and kinsman, are not likely to forget easily its true meaning and significance.

India is perhaps the most conservative country in the world. It tenaciously clings to the old, and if Lord Buddha were to rise again and revisit the scenes of his earthly mission, he would probably see but a few changes in the life and mentality of the people; and if he went far inland, into places not yet penetrated by the Railways, he would recognize, even in the costumes of the people, those to whom he had spoken in his previous birth. The spell of the unchanging East may be inimical to material progress, but it furnishes a ready material for the exercise of the imagination, the reconstruction of a scene and reproduction of the environment, which offer the best background for the right appreciation of the drama which portrayed the hollowness of human life, and unselfishness as its only panacea. Stated as a copy-book maxim, this moral would be regarded as trivial because of its universal truism. But the virtue of a maxim is not so much in its statement as in its elucidation bringing home conviction. Again, in metaphysical

dialectics, the teacher addresses his words to those in whom he presumes a certain degree of acquaintance with the main tenets of the ruling creed. He reinforces his arguments and refutes those of his adversaries, assuming on the part of his hearers the counter-arguments he refutes and the outline of the view he elucidates.

To the foreigner these dialectics present difficulties which the Hindu cannot understand. That they do present difficulties even to European savants, may be concluded from what they have themselves admitted: "The meaning which he conveyed by such words we can often only approximately determine. Here, as in every case, where the word has a preponderant importance over the thought, where it does not smoothly fit the thought, but compresses it within its own straight form, the inquirer, who desires to reconstruct remote and foreign forms of thought has not that surest key which consecutive progression, the inherent necessity of the thought, can give him."⁽¹⁾ "When we try to resuscitate, in our own way and in our own language, the thoughts that are embedded in the Buddhist teaching, we can scarcely help forming the impression that it was not a mere idle statement which the sacred texts preserve to us, that the Perfect One knew much more (which He thought inadvisable to say), than what he esteemed it profitable to his disciples to unfold. For, that which is declared points for its explanation and completion to something else, which is passed over in silence—for it seemed not to serve for quietude, illumination, the Nirvan—but of which we can scarcely help believing that it was really present in the minds of Buddha and those disciples to whom we owe the compilation of the dogmatic texts."⁽²⁾ As to this, it is sufficient to state that the Perfect One never affected any mental reservation. On the other hand, on the eve of his death, he made it plain that he had kept back nothing that he knew, from his advanced disciples: "What need hath the body of my followers of me now, Anand? I have declared the Doctrine, Anand, and I have made no distinction between within and without; the Perfect

(1) Oldenberg's *Buddha*, p. 207.

(2) *Ib.* p. 208.

One has not, Anand, been a forgetful teacher of the Doctrine.”⁽¹⁾

That is then conclusive of the mentality of the Teacher. The difficulties experienced by western scholars in understanding Buddhism, arise from the fact that they regard it as a religion or a philosophy apart, whereas it is only a new commentary on an old system—a new graft on an old trunk which cannot be learnt or understood apart.

Again, since the dialogues were in many cases intended to answer queries or allay doubts, they are necessarily disjointed and discursive, and in places contradictory.

It seemed, then, to the present writer that the method he had himself followed in studying the subject, might be usefully employed in elucidating it to others. He has consequently followed the purely historical method; but in expounding the tenets of the new religion, he has attempted to summarize the then prevailing views of life and then given Buddh's comments and criticisms upon them—often assumed or implied, or at most faintly hinted at by a passing insinuation or an innuendo, which were sufficiently and in fact pungently clear to those who sat at his feet, and which are clear enough to those who have to live in the system to which Buddh's frequent allusions unerringly refer.

A work following this method must necessarily be a singular departure from the beaten track hallowed by the tread of a century of Orientalists and European expounders of oriental thought. It is intended to give a plain and impartial version of the life and doctrine of Buddh, a life which is an example of all that is best in mankind, and a doctrine which has leavened all religious teachings since. The writer cannot be accused of undue partiality to Buddhism; for, though he is a humble member of the caste upon which Gautam has shed imperishable lustre, he has not yet persuaded himself to accept his creed; and he has, therefore, not refrained from criticising wherever he felt it his duty to caution or criticize.

(1) Oldenberg's *Buddha*, pp. 197, 198.

The work is intended to be a popular, but withal a critical study of Buddhism. The narrative is intended for the lay reader, while the notes furnish a groundwork for the scholar who wishes to systematize his knowledge of a religion, which, more than a religion, has moulded the lives of nearly a third of the inhabitants of the globe.

A word ■ necessary to explain the new style of spelling adopted in this work. European writers have adopted a form of spelling which is neither natural nor phonetic since, some of them use either the letter *c* or *k* to convey the sound "ch" as in "church", while others adopt other spellings. The ultimate "a" added to "Buddh" and other names of places and persons is intended to be silent; but in practice the reader seldom heeds the warning. Other words such as "Ashoke" and "Jaatak" are spelt as "Asoka" or "Jataka"—which gives rise to varied pronunciations except the right one. In this work all spellings of such words have, so far as possible, followed their phonetic sounds.

But the Roman Alphabet is conspicuously deficient in two dental alphabets for which it provides no serviceable substitutes: These are the Pali *ṭ* and *ḍ*. Two new letters **Ṭ** (*ṭ*) and **Ḍ** (*ḍ*) have been invented to express those sounds. The cross line in each case indicates that the letter is dental and not palatal. Thus **Ṭ** will take the place of *ṭ*, and **Ḍ** of *ḍ* and will sound as *Th* in *Thus*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Pages.
PREFACE.	i—iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.	
CHRONOLOGY.	v—vi
GLOSSARY.	vii—xv
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	xvi—xxi
DESCRIPTIVE NOTES ON THE ILLUSTRATIONS.	xxii—xxix

CHAPTER.	Pages.
I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION.	1—42
II. INDIA BEFORE BUDDHISM.	43—52
III. FAITHS AND PHILOSOPHY IN BUDDH'S TIME.	53—76
IV. LIFE OF BUDDH. FROM BIRTH TO ENLIGHTENMENT.	77—96
V. THE GREAT RENUNCIATION.	97—108
VI. FROM BUDDHHOOD TO RETURN HOME.	109—137
VII. FROM HIS RETURN TO THE END.	138—183
VIII. LEGENDARY LIFE OF BUDDH.	184—191
IX. LATER DEVELOPMENTS.	192—229
X. BUDDHIST MYTHOLOGY.	230—236
XI. RULES OF THE BROTHERHOOD.	239—273
XII. THE DOCTRINE OF BUDDHISM.	274—311
XIII. THE PATH TO NIRVAN.	312—338
XIV. THE ONLY WAY.	339—348
XV. THE SECRET DOCTRINE.	349—373
XVI. HIS PRECEPTS AND PARABLES.	374—412
XVII. BUDDHISM AND OTHER FAITHS.	413—449
XVIII. BUDDHISM AND CHRISTIANITY.	450—462
XIX. BUDDHISM AND MODERN THOUGHT.	463—498
XX. BUDDHISM AND MODERN PROGRESS.	499—531
XXI. BUDDHISM AS THE UNIVERSAL RELIGION.	532—545
XXII. THE EPILOGUE.	546—554
INDEX.	

CHRONOLOGY

<i>Year.</i>	<i>Events in Buddhism.</i>	<i>Year.</i>	<i>Other contemporary events.</i>
B. C.		B. C.	
622	Buddh born in Lambini Garden, 27 miles N. E. of Kapilvastu.	600	Lao-Tza born.
593	The enlightenment (Buddh aged 29).	589	Zoroaster born (<i>d.</i> 539).
582	Bimveshwar, King of Magadh, contemporary of Buddh and Mahavir, becomes their patron.	587	Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, takes Jerusalem: Jews exiled to Babylon.
554	Ajatshatru, son of Bimveshwar, conquered Visali and Koushal; supports both Buddh and Mahavir.	551	Confucius born (<i>d.</i> 478).
543	Death of Buddh.	538	The Persians capture Babylon. Jews return but remain under Persia, (587-320).
543	First Buddhist Council.		Darius I, King of Persia (521 B.C.) conquers the Punjab.
...	...	516	Inscription of Darius I mentioning India and Gandhar among his provinces.
...	...	490	Battle of Marathon between Persia and Greece—Persians routed.
...	...	480	Xerxes' second expedition against Greece.
443	Second Buddhist Council.	469	Socrates born (<i>d.</i> 399).
...	...	429	Plato born (<i>d.</i> 347).
...	...	384	Aristotle born (<i>d.</i> 322).
...	...	338	Philip of Macedonia defeats Thebes and Athens and annexes Greece.

<i>Year.</i>	<i>Events in Buddhism.</i>	<i>Year.</i>	<i>Other contemporary events.</i>
B. C.		B. C.	
...	...	332	Alexander takes Palestine.
...	...	331	Alexander crushes Persia.
327-5	Alexander's Invasion of India.
323	Death of Alexander at Babylon (in May or June.)
322	Expulsion of the Macedonian garrison by Chandragupta Maurya.	321	Alexander destroyed Persian Empire and assigned Babylon to Seleucus Nikator.
321	His accession.
302	Embassy of Megasthenes to Chandragupta at Patna.
273	Accession of Ashoke.
269	His Coronation.
259	Abolished the Imperial Hunt—sent Missionaries.
257-6	The fourteen rock edicts.		
251-250	Mahendra's Mission to Ceylon.
244	"Hinyan" or Canon of the Southern Buddhists settled.
242	Publication of the seven pillar edicts.
240-232	Third Buddhist Council: Minor pillar edicts condemning schism.
232 } 222 }	or Ashoke died at Taxilla.	63	Rome takes Jerusalem.
40 A.D.	Fourth and last Buddhist Council under King Kanishka.

GLOSSARY

English.

Meaning.

- Abhidharma—अभिधर्म** ... *Abhi*—further, beyond, *Dharm*—law, “further law;” a commentary on the Canon.
- Advait—अद्वैत** ... *A*—not, *Dvait*—second, “no second” element. “Absolute monism”.
- Ajit—अजित** ... *Keshkambali*, a sect of Nihilists, who believed in no life but this, and maintained it to be devoid of reality. They denied the result of good or evil deeds and, of course, *Karm* and its effect upon the course of human life, Founder of Nihilism.
- Ajivak—अजीवक** ... *Nakhali Goshal* was the leader of Ajivak and was *Buddh*’s contemporary.
- Anesaki—अनेसकी** ... “Buddhist Art” in relation to Buddhist ideals, with special reference to Buddhism in Japan. (Murray—1916 pp. 73 plates).
- Arhat—अर्हत्** ... *Arhi*—a “carnet” extremely deserving, very reverend; a term applied to advanced Bhikshus.
- Arya—आर्य** ... *Arya*—worthy of reverence, a term applied to the Buddhists.
- Aryan—आर्यन** ... “*Arya*”—Aryan race; a term opposed to *alien*.
- Ashwamedh—अश्वमेध** ... *Ashwa*—horse, *Medh*—sacrifice, “horse-sacrifice,” performed by Purushmitra.
- Asay—आसव** ... *Asaya*—depravity (of 4 kinds). *Kamasaya*—means desire, attachment, pleasure and thirst associated with the senses. *Bhavasaya*—means desire, attachment.
- ... (*Pali-Attu*, soul), “I” “self.” Hence “The Ego”—the soul.

English.	Meaning.
Avijja—	... (Sk. <i>Avidya</i> —Ignorance), “absence of <i>Vidya</i> or knowledge.”
Avalokiteshwar—अवलोकितेश्वर ...	<i>Ava</i> ,—favourably, kindly ; <i>Lokit</i> —looking, <i>Isva</i> r—God; a god who looks kindly. A new God created by the Order. God looking upon men with pity; corresponds to the Hindu <i>Shiv</i> ; in China—kwon-she-yen.
Bhikshu—भिक्षु	... (Sk. <i>Bhiksh</i> —to beg, Pali- <i>Bhikkhu</i>) ; <i>Bhiksha</i> —“ alms ; ” “ <i>Bhikshuk</i> ”—a beggar. A Buddhist mendicant ; so called because he begs instruction for the mind, and food for the body.
Buddh—बुद्ध	... (Sk. <i>Buddh</i> —to know and <i>Buddh</i> —known. Pali— <i>Bodh</i> —Knowledge). Hence “ <i>Buddh</i> ”—“ One who has acquired knowledge,” “ The wise,” “ The Enlightened,”

But per Childers' *Pali Dictionary* the word is derived from *Vaddhasi* and means “old”, “aged” and hence “Enlightened.” The term now refers to Gautam Buddha founder of Buddhism, according to which there have been 24 Buddhas who preceded Gautam, after whom only one Buddha the “*Metteyya Buddha* (मैत्रेय i.e., “Friendly Buddha”) is to come. The preceding 24 Buddhas were: (1) *Dipankar*. (दीपंकर) (2) *Kondanno* (कण्ठन) (3) *Mangal* (मङ्गल) (4) *Sumane* (सुमन) (5) *Revata* (रेवत) (6) *Subhita* (सुभित) (7) *Anomadassi* (आनन्ददीप्ति) (8) *Paduma* (पद्म) (9) *Naradi* (नारद) (10) *Padumittar* (पद्मोत्तर) (11) *Sumeḍḍh* (सुमेध) (12) *Sujata* (सुजात) (13) *Piyadassi* (प्रियदर्शी) (14) *Atthadassi* (अष्टदर्शी) (15) *Dhammadassi* (धम्मदर्शी) (16) *Siddharth* (सिद्धार्थ) (17) *Vissu* (विसु) (18) *Phussa* (फोसु) (19) *Vipasi* (विपासी) (20) *Sikhi* (

Meaning.

(21) *Vesabha* (विषभः) (22) *Kakusanāḥhe* (ककुषाहः) (23) *Konḍagamano* (कण्डगामनः) (24) *Kashyap* (काश्यप)—(*Mahavans XXXII-1-2; Dhammapaḍ* (Ed. V. Fana-boll Copenhagen 1855) 116, 117; Bur-nouf (P.E.) *Le. Lotus de la Bonne Loi* (Paris 1852) 335.

Bimveshwar—विम्वेश्वर

... Name of the King of Magadh; ■ contemporary of Buddha called in Pali Bim-bisara.

Sk. *Bimb*.—Disc of the Sun or Moon, *Ishwar* "The Lord," *Lit.* " Lord of the Sun "; " The Sun-god."

Bodhisa va—बोधिसत्व

... *Bodhi*—knowledge and *Sattu*—in embryo. A *Bodhisattu* is one in whom true knowledge is rather latent and undeveloped. Buddha had been a *Bodhi-sattu* in his immediate previous birth.

Chaitya—चैत्य

... Sk. *chi*—to heap; *chita*—a tumulus, a sepulchral monument, cairn; later, used to denote an Assembly-Hall of the Buddhist order in which the image of Buddha was worshipped.

Chakravarti—चक्रवर्ती

... (*Chakra*—wheel, *varti*—ruler) *Lit.* "Wheel King," a monarch who rules all within the Chakra of rocks supposed to surround the world; hence " Universal monarch " (Beal's *Catena*—128). But *Chakra* equally means " the globe " and the word would then bear the same meaning.

Charvak—चार्वाक

... (*Charv*—"to chew"), Charvak is the reputed founder of the Epicurean system of Indian atheists who do not believe in God, Soul, or Hereafter. The Charvaks were subdivided into two sub-sects—the *Sushikshit* and the *Dhurt*; the former believe in the existence of the soul, which, however, perished with the body; the latter deny its existence and only

English.

Meaning.

believe in the existence of 4 elements, namely, earth, water, air and fire, and that the body ■ the result of atomic combination.

- Dhamma—धम्म** ... (*Dham*—Duty) Bears a varying meaning in Buddhist literature. Generally speaking, it means religion or duty of a Buddhist. But it is also used in other senses in e.g., scriptural texts as embodying the religion; quality of man (*guna*); cause (*hetu*); and the unsubstantial and soul-less entity.
- Dhammapad—धम्मपद** ... (*Dhamma*—religion; and *Pad*—feet), foot—steps), “footsteps of religion.”
- Dhyan—ध्यान** ... Abstract meditation.
- Digha Nikaya—दीर्घ निकायः** ... (Sk. *Dirgh*—major, large; *Nikaya*—collection, body) the Bible, “Dialogues of the Buddha” 2 S.B.E. (3 Sorts).
- Dulva—दुल्ल** ... Tibetan Vinay or Canon included in Bkah-Hgyur.
- Fa-Hian—फा हियन** ... See Beal.
- Gridhrakut Parvat—गृध्रकुट पर्वत** ... (Sk. *Gridhra*—vulture, *Kut*—peak, *Parvat*—Mountain), “Vulture’s peak” where Buddha often resided—a hill near Raj-graha.
- Hina Varga—हीनवर्ग** ... Corresponding Hin-Vagg. (*Hin*—small, *Varg*—sections). Smallest sections.
- Kapilvastu—कपिलवास्तु** ... Modern Bhila, a town half-way between Basti and Ajudhya.
- Karm—कर्म** ... (Pali—*Karm* “Fate.”). The law of moral rectitude, a soul’s path through the world of earthly scene, of heaven and hell.
- Kashyap—कश्यप** ... (*Kashyap*) (Sk. *Kashya*—liquor, and *pa*—to drink); drinker of liquor; Kashyap is the name of a sage.
- Katantak Venuban—कालांतक वन** (Bamboo-grove of Katantak).
- Khand—खण्ड** ... *Khand*—a division, a part, a group or groups.

English.

Meaning.

- Khanda—खण्ड** ... (Sk. *Skandh*—the trunk of a tree), means group or aggregate. The *Khandas* are aggregates of bodily and physical states and are divided into five classes (1) *Rupa* (form ; e.g. body ; the five senses) (2) *Vedana* (sensation of pleasurable and painful feeling); (3) *Sanka* (Conceptual knowledge, (4) *Sankhar* (compound synthesis or aggregate of concepts and feelings), (5) *Vigyan* (consciousness)—*Samvutta Nikaya* III 86-*seq.*
- Khuddakapath—खुद्दकपथ** ... (*Khuddak*—small, *Path*—readings) less one study, lesser studyings.
- Mahasāvira—महासविर** ... (Sk. *Mahat*—great; *Sthavir*—senior); (Pali-Maha-*thera*) ; the great elders.
- Mahavajja—महावज्जा** ... (Sk. *Vach*—to speak, Pali *vajja*—sayings); *Mahavajja*—Great teachings.
- Mahavarga—महावर्ग** ... (Pali-Mahavagga) ; (Sk. *Maha*, big, great ; *Varga*, sections, divisions, chapters) ; great sections.
- Mahayan—महायान** ... (*Maha*—big, *Ya*—to go, Lit. “that by which, on which or in which one goes,”) Hence a road, a path-way. “The great way” or “vehicle” of salvation ; as opposed to the *Hinayan*, or “the smallest vehicle.”
- Manjushri—मञ्जुश्री** ... (*Manju*—beautiful, lovely ; *Shri*,—God) ; “The beautiful God,” the name of ■ *Bodhisattva* in the Buddhist Trinity.
- Mara—मारा** ... (Sk. *Maranam*—Death, *Mri*—to die), killing, slaughter, (Lat. *Mors*—death, *Morrior*—to die). Hence death personified, “God of death.” Mar is the Satan of Buddhist Mythology.
- Nihana—निहान** ... See Nirvan.
- Nikayas—निकायाः** ... (*Nikaya*, a heap, a collection of men) ; a congregation, a body of men.

English.	Meaning.
Nirgaṇṭh—निर्गन्ध	... (<i>Nir</i> —without; <i>gaṇṭh</i> —tie); without ties “without encumbrances.” A term applied to Bhikṣus.
Nirodḥ—निरोध	... See Nirvan.
Nirvan—निर्वाण	... (<i>Nir</i> —without and <i>van</i> —“desire”): a state of mind without craving or desire; a state of mental bliss, arising from the control of desires. ■ ■ synonymous with <i>Nirvṛitti</i> , <i>Nirodḥ</i> (Pali- <i>Nibanna</i> , <i>Nibutti</i> , <i>Nibutta</i>); in the Buddhist Canon used to mean the bliss arising from an immunity from human passions producing a blissful existence free from egocentric life. It is called the Unconditional, the Abstract, the Uncreated, the Infinite, the Eternal, the Formless, the Invisible. When Buddha abandoned his life in the Palace, he said, “I will search for the peace of <i>Nirvan</i> ” (“the word he used was <i>Nibutta</i> —which means “happiness.”)
Om—ओम्	... Abbreviation of the initial letters of the Vedic triad;—namely <i>Agni</i> , <i>Indra</i> and <i>Mitra</i> : “A.I.M.”—“Om.” This was originally an invocation to the three great gods of the Vedas. But later on, the word became a mere introductory, auspicious expletion which was pronounced at the beginning of all prayers, sacrifices, etc. They are said to possess mystic value in the Yoge philosophy, being the most potent means whereby human thoughts are concentrated upon the Supreme Being, typified by these symbols.
Paṇḍmapāṇi—पद्मपाणि	... (<i>Paṇḍma</i> —lotus; <i>Pāṇi</i> —hands); “lotus-handed.”
Panna—पद्म	... Wisdom.
Paramit—पारमि	... Transcendent, (<i>Lit.</i> that which enables one to cross over to the other shore).

<i>English.</i>	<i>Meaning.</i>
Parinirvan—परिनिर्वाण	... (<i>Pari</i> —absolute, <i>Nirvan</i> —salvation). A salvation in which there ■ no re-birth.
Parivar—परिवार	... Appendix.
Prabhag—प्रभञ्ज	... (<i>Pali</i> , <i>Prabhag</i> —"going out,") the first initiatory ceremony for conversion of a person to be a pupil, or disciple.
Pratyek Buddh—प्रत्येक बुद्ध	... "Every one," self-dependent, solitary Buddh ; "solitary saint."
Prithak Jan—प्रथक् जन	... (<i>Prithvi</i> —earth, <i>Prithak</i> —earthly ; <i>Jan</i> —man). A worldly man, as distinguished from an <i>Arya</i> , who was a monk.
Puthu Jan—पुथुजन	... (<i>Sk.</i> <i>Prithvi</i> —"Earth, world ;" <i>Jan</i> —men) ; "many folk," the multitude, the unlearned.
Samaghi—समाधि	... Concentration.
Sangit—संगीत	... (<i>Sk.</i> <i>Sam</i> —together ; <i>geetam</i> —song) ; singing together ; (<i>Pali</i> <i>Sangit</i> —songs sung together)
Sanskar—संस्कार	... (<i>P.</i> <i>Sankar</i> — <i>Sanskar</i> — <i>Sam</i> —together, <i>Kara</i> "to do," hence, putting together). "The aggregates" or "Impressions" and predispositions inherited from a previous birth. <i>Sanskars</i> are of 3 kinds (1) Those which have a pure end in view ; (2) Those which have an impure end in view ; (3) Those which are neutral.
Sanskaro—संस्कारी	... See Sanakar.
Shraman—श्रमण	... (<i>Shram</i> —to toil, <i>Shraman</i> —"labourers" ; <i>Pali-Shramera</i> , <i>Shrama</i>) a term applied to <i>Bhikshus</i> .
Shrawak—श्रावक	... (Hearers), great disciples.
Shila—शील	... Discipline.
Skandhas—स्कन्धः	... See Khandas.
Sutra—सूत्र	... (<i>Sk.</i> <i>Sutra</i> ,—"a thread" ; <i>Pali</i> — <i>Sutra</i>) ; Aphorism, which is a mnemonic aid to a statement. In the Buddhistic books, it means a discourse, a chapter or a

English.

Meaning.

small portion ■ a sacred book dealing with a point of sacred law.

Sutras are the words of Buddha addressed to his disciples.

Sthavir—स्त्वविर

... (thara) "elder".

Tapas—तपस्

... Bodily mortification.

Tathagat—तथागत

... *Lit.* "One who goes the way of all flesh," i.e., "One who is subject to death," mortal; it was afterwards applied to Buddha as meaning "the Being *par excellence*, the Great Being," just in the same way as Jesus was described as "the Son of man." But since "*agat*" means also "come," latterly the term is explained by the devout to mean "One who has come the same way" i.e., "he who has come here following the law." But as Childers remarks: "The naive explanations of the term are purely fanciful." *Pali Dictionary* *Ti Tathagat* 498, 499; Burnouf P. E. Introduction A. L. *Histoire de Buddhism-Indian*: Paris 1844. 75).

Tripitaks—त्रिपिटकाः

... (Sk. *Tri*—three and *Pitak*—basket). *Lit.* "Three Baskets." The Buddhist sacred scriptures; so called, because they are divided into three parts namely; (1) *Vinai Suttas* (dealing with Discipline), (2) *Sutta*—*Sutras*, (which are sayings and aphorisms relating to the Doctrine); and (3) *Abhi Dharm* (*Abhi*—after, and *Dharm*—law: Commentary on the Doctrine). It really deals with Metaphysics. The tripartite classification is only rough, since in point of fact, books on the one basket contain a great deal of what should logically belong to another basket. The "Pitaks" collectively form a Canon of Holy-Writ and, as such, are invested by the Buddhists

English.

Meaning.

- with all the sanctity due to their Holy Scripture, which are believed to contain the actual words of the Master, the text of which was settled at the first council held immediately after Buddha's Nirvan.
- Upasak**—उपासक ... (Worshipper) The worshipper of Buddha.
- Upasampad**—उपसम्पद ... The ceremony for admission to full monkhood.
- Upasath**—उपसत्थ ... (Sk. *Upasathitum*—a fast); a fast-day.
- Vajrapani**—वज्रपाणि ... (*Vajra*—"lightning," "thunderbolt"; *Pani*—hand); "With thunderbolt in his hands."
- Do.** ... *Vajrapani* corresponds to *Brahma* or *Vishwakarma* (lord of speech), corresponds also to *Saraswati*.
- Varsha**—वर्षा ... (Sk. *Varsha*; Pali *Vassa*) rain; The rainy season, June to October, in which the *Bhikshus* met to rest and reflect in one place. Hence, "The Period of Retreat."
- Vijnan**—विज्ञान ... Cognition, ("Chita"—mind or consciousness).
- Vihar**—विहार ... (Sk. *Vihar*—wandering for pleasure). Hence "A pleasure-garden," monastery. (The name of *Bihar*, a Province of India, is a corruption of *Vihar*, so called because of its numerous monasteries).
- Vinai**—विनय ... (*Vinai*—discipline). Buddha's Code of discipline.
- Yoge**—योग ... (Sk. *Yuj*—to join; *Lit.*—union; *Yugom*—yoke). The science which teaches how to join the human spirit with the Universal Soul. The primary aim of every man who practises *Yoge* is the Mystic union (or rather re-union) of his own spirit with one Eternal Soul or Spirit of the Universe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- Beal (Samuel)** ... **A catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese** (Trubner, 1871, Demy 8vo; 425 pp.).
- Beal** ... "**Buddhist records of the Western World**" (S. Beal); Kegan Paul, 1906, 2 vols.)—contains translations of the three Chinese Pilgrims to India—Fa-Hian (400 A.D.)—Introduction XXIII-LXXXIII, Sung-Yun (518 A.D.), *Ibid.*—LXXXIV-CVIII; Hiuen Tsiang and his account of 34 countries in India, (629-645 A.D.) Vol. 1-1-240, Vol. 11-1-326.
- Buddhghosh** ... **Commentary on the Digha Nikaya** (orig. Pali Text. Davids and Carpenter, P.T.S. 1886, Demy 8 vo. pp. 348). Vol. 1. Translated by Mg. Tin, P.T.S., Demy 8 vo. pp. 287.
- Buddhism** ... **By Mrs. Rhys Davids, M.A., London, William and Norgate, (No date) Crown, 255 pp. (Home University Library Series).**
- Buddh Charitra** ... **Or the life of Buddha of Ashvghosh;** translated in 49 S.B.E. by Prof. E. B. Cowell—**Legendary Life of Buddha, Probable date—1st century, A.D.**
- Buddhist Sutras** ... **(The Book of the Great Deccan and other Sutras).** Translated in 11, S.B.E. Demy 8 vo. pp. 309.
- Childers (Robert Caesar)** ... *See Pali Dictionary.*
- Chinese Buddhism** ... "**The Buddhist canon includes 1,440 distinct works comprising 5,586 books. But these form only a fractional part of the Buddhist literature which is spread throughout the Empire.**" Preface to Rev. S. Beal's **Catena of Buddhist Scriptures.**

- Coomaraswamy (Anand K) **History of Indian and Indonesian Art.**
(London Edn. Coldston, 1927, large, pp. 295, with 400 specimen illustrations).
(This work includes a complete Bibliography on the Buddhist Art pp. 214-218).
- Copleston (R.S.) ... **Buddhism, primitive and present, in Magadh and in Ceylon.** (London, Longmans 1892, 1 Roy, 816, pp. 501.)
(Second Edition, London 1908, 1 vo. pp. 301).
- Das Gupta ... **A History of Indian Philosophy, *vide***
pp. 78-166.
- Davids, (Mrs. Rhys) ... **Buddhism** (William and Norgate, London, Crown pp. 255. Home University Library Series).
- Dharmapala ... Translated in 10 S.B.E.
- Driesch, (Hans) ... **Mind and Body** (Tr. Methuen, London, Cr. pp. 561): Shows that psycho-physiological parallelism is insufficient to explain the formations of the mind, though its real nature is not explained.
- Foucher ... **Beginnings of Buddhist Art** (London, Humphrey Milford, 1917, pp. 313, illustrated 50 plates).
- Gruenwedel (A) ... **Buddhist Art in India** (German); translated by A.C. Gibson, (London, Bernard Quaritch, 1901, pp. 214.)
- Grimm (George) ... **The Doctrine of the Buddha; the Religion of Reason** (Leipzig, W. Drugulin, 1926, Roy 8 vo., pp. 536. No Index.)
"Christianity having lost its mandate, the only hope of humanity lies in its conversion to Buddhism."
- Hackmann (H) ... **Buddhism as a Religion** (Probsthain & Co., 41, Great Russel St., London, W.C., 1910, Crown 8vo., pp. 315). Describes modern Buddhism in the Buddhist countries.

- Hall (H. Fielding) ... *"The soul of a people,"* describes Buddhism in Burma. 4th Edition, London 1902, Demy 8 vo.
- Hardy (Rev. R. Spence) *Eastern Monachism. An Account of the origin, laws, discipline, sacred writings, mysterious rites, religious ceremonies and present circumstances of the order of mendicants founded by Gautam Buddha, with comparative notices of the usages and institutions of the Western Ascetics; and a review of the Monastic system.* (London, Partridge and Oakley, 1850, Demy 8vo., pp. 443).
- Hsuen Tsiang ... *See Beal.*
- Jaatak ... (Jaatak—"Jati"—*birth*: *Ja*—to be (born); Lat. (*gero*—to be); collection of 547 stories of Buddha's previous Births, Ed. 1906, 1913, E. B. Cowell, (7 vols., Large 8vo., Camb. Press, 1895, about 300 pp. each).
- Jaina Sutras ... Translated in 22, 45 S.B.E.
- Lalit Vistara ... *Legendary life of Buddha.* Published in original Sanskrit by Halle, Germany, 1902, II Vols. Roy. 8 vo. pp. 444 & pp. 260. Leading scenes from this work numbering 120, are carved out in stone as mural frescos on the "Stupa" etc., of Barabudur in Java about 750-850 A.D. The "Stupa" was a memorial and owed its importance to the relics preserved beneath it, or the events it was intended to corroborate. The pictorial carvings were accompanied by sacred texts, giving the life-story of the historic Buddha. An English translation of these frescos, together with photographic engravings of the pictorial description, edited by Dr. N. J. Krom, Professor at the Leyden University, is published by Martinus Nijhoff at the Hague, 1926, under the title of

"The Life of Buddha." 131 pp., 120 plates. The *Lalit Vistara* is thus the sculptured life ■ Buddha to which are added the appropriate explanatory texts. The latter constitute the description to which the former are vivid illustrations.

- Mahavansh** ... (The Great Chronicle ■ Ceylon). Translated by Dr. W. Geiger. Published P. T. S. London. Demy 8 Vo. pp. 300.
- Mahayan Suttas** ... 49 S.B.E.
- Oldenberg (Dr. Hermann)** ... Buddha, his life, his doctrine, his order. Translated from German by William Hoey. Published by William and Norgate, 1882, Roy. 8 Vo. pp. 454.
- Pali Dictionary** ... By Robert Caesar Childers, 1909, London, Kegan Paul, 4th Impression, (pp. 1-68). Arranged in the order of the English Alphabet with words printed in Nagri characters. The new edition of this work issued by the P.T.S. under supervision of the late R. Davids follows the arrangement of the Pali Alphabet and omits to print the words in Nagri.
- Raghakrishna** ... Indian Philosophy, Vol I (1923), George Allen, London, Demy 8 vo., pp. 669, Index 671-684 gives a summary of Buddhist Philosophy in pp. 341-669.
- Rapson, E. T.** ... "Cambridge History of India" (Vol. I Ancient India), Ed. E. T. Rapson—gives early history of Buddhism, (Ch. VII by T. W. Rhys Davids, pp. 171-197, a condensed account, following the author's "Buddhist India").
- Rhys Davids (Mrs.) C.A.F.** ... Buddhist Psychology (G. Bell, London, 1914, F. Cr. pp. 212.)
- Rockhill, W. W.** ... Life of the Buddha and the early history of his order derived from the Tibetan works, in the Bkah-Hgyur and Bstan-Hgyur (T.O.S. 1884, Demy 8vo., 273 pp.)

- Sankhya Aphorisms** ... (Dr. J. R. Ballantyne) T.S.O. sub-divided into six books. Bk. 1 comprises 164 aphorisms, deals with the general principles.
- Saṅgharm-Pundarik** ... (1st. Cen. A.D.) (The Lotus ■ the True Law). Translated in ■ S.B.E. A collection of nine works ; 1st contains an abstract of the Philosophy of Buddhism, 7th is on the esoteric doctrine, the remaining deal with a view to illustrate every point of the ordinary doctrine and discipline.
- Scheltema (J. F.)** ... Monumental Java (London, MacMillan, Demy 8 vo., pp. 302), Ch. VII (177-206 deals with Buddhism in Java ; assumes Buddh to be the personification of the Solar Myth).
- Shat Shastras** ... ("Six Instruments of True Knowledge").
- Simpson, W. M.** ... Buddhist Praying (MacMillan, 1896, Roy 8 vo., pp. 303). A collection of materials bearing upon the symbol of the wheel and circular movements in custom and religious ritual.
- Sinnett, A. P.** ... Esoteric Buddhism (Trubner 2nd Ed. 1883, Cr., pp. 215), explains the secret doctrine of Buddhism.
- Si-Yu-Ki** ... (Tr. S. Beal). (Vol. 1 and 2 Trubner's O.S.)
- Smith (V. A.)** ... "Early History of India, including Alexander's campaign" (4th Edition, 1924, Clarendon Press, Oxford, Demy 8vo., pp. 535.)
- Sung Yun** ... See Beal.
- Texts of Confucianism** ... (27, 28 S.B.E.)
- Texts of Taoism** ... Translated in 39, 40 S.B.E.
- Tibetan Buddhism** ... Life of Buddh and an account of his teachings is contained in two works called Bkah-Hgyur, Betan-Hgyur which is the basis of W. W. Rockhill's "Life of Buddh."

- Tibetan Legends ... On the Life and teachings of Gautam Buddha, Bkah-Hgyur and Bstan-Hgyur, which includes the Tibetan Vinaya called *Bulva* or Vinaya Pitak "which is unquestionably the most trustworthy, and probably the oldest portion of Bkah-Hgyur," (Intro. VI Rockhill, *Life of Buddha*) embodied in "The Life of Buddha" by W. W. Rockhill (T.O.S.)
- Travels of the Chinese Pilgrims. ... See Beal.
- Vinaya Texts ... Translated in 12, 17, 20 S.B.E.
- Vinaya Pitak ... *Vinai*—Ethics, conduct; *Pitak*—basket; *Lit.* a basket of ethics or morality. (*Mahavagga* and *Kulla vagga*, translated by R. Davids and H. Oldenberg under the title *Vinaya texts*. 13, 17, 20 S.B.E.)
- Zend Avesta ... Translated in 4, 23, 31 S.B.E.

DESCRIPTIVE NOTES ON THE ILLUSTRATIONS.

[This note is drawn by Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Shahni, Deputy Director-General of Archaeology with the permission of Sir John Marshall, Director-General of Archaeology in India, to whom the author is indebted for the photographs supplied by the Government of India for publication in this book.]

1. A stone Stale (*Urdha-pala*) showing four principal events of Buddha's life which was found at Sarnath, and is now preserved in the Indian Museum ■ Calcutta. The four scenes are arranged chronologically from below upwards. The lowest scene represents the birth of the Bodhisattva in the Lumbini garden (modern Rummindoi) near Kapilavastu. His mother, Maya-devi, stands in the centre under a *Sal* tree, with her sister, Prajapati, standing behind her. The child is being received by Indra, while in the upper left corner, we see the baby being given his first bath by the Naga Kings, Nanda and Upananda. The next division represents the enlightenment of the Buddha at Bodhi Gaya, near Gaya. In the centre is the Buddha seated in the *Bhumisparśa-mudra* on a stone throne, under a *pipal* tree. To his proper right is the Evil One (Mara) standing, holding his bow. The two female figures to the left of the Buddha are two of the three daughters of Mara (*viz.*, Desire, Pleasure and Lust.) The upper corners of the panel show two of the Rakshasas of Mara's army who attempted in vain to intimidate the Buddha on this occasion. The defeated Satan is shown seated in despair near the right knee of the Buddha. The next upper division of the sculpture represents the first sermon of the Buddha—in the Deer Park (Sanskrit, *Mriga-Dara*), modern Sarnath. The hands of the Buddha are held in front of the breast in the attitude of expounding the law (*Dharma-chakra-mudra*). The figure standing to the right of the Buddha, holding a "Chauri" in his right hand and a rosary in his left, is the Bodhisattva Maitreya, the Messiah of the Buddhists. The corresponding figure on the other side, holding a full-blown lotus in the left hand, is the Bodhisattva Padmapani or Avalokitesvara. The wheel in front of the base represents the wheel of the law and the two deer, the Deer Park (modern Sarnath). The uppermost panel represents the death or *Parinirvana* of the Master which took place under a grove of *Sal* trees at Kusanagara (modern Kasia, District Gorakhpur). In accordance with the Buddhist texts, the Buddha is represented as lying on his right side, facing to the front. The sculpture dates about from the 5th century A.D. and must have been carved ■ Sarnath. (Sunk in gold at the back ■ the cover.)

2. *Wheel of Law* (embossed on front cover.) For explanation see pp. 528-538.

3. Colossal statue of Gautama Buddha as Bodhisattva, which was discovered during the excavations of 1904-05 at Sarnath. By the side of ■ was lying a large stone umbrella, which originally sheltered it in place of a temple. According to an inscription incised on its base, the statue was carved under the supervision of a Buddhist monk named Bala, who was well-versed in the Tripitaka, and erected at the promenade of the Blessed One at Benares in the third year of the reign ■ Kanihka. The statue is made of the same kind of red sandstone, as was generally used for the Mathura sculptures, and was carved at Mathura which in the Kushana and Gupta periods supplied images to other holy places of the Buddhists.

The little figure of a lion between the feet of the statue is intended to identify it as a representation of Gautama Buddha who is frequently referred to as Sakya-Simha or the Lion of the Sakya race.

The large stone umbrella which sheltered Friar Bala's statue referred to above together with its post of the same material, was according to two inscriptions engraved at the back of the statue and on the post, also carved under the supervision of the same monk. All these were discovered by Mr. F. O. Oertel of the Public Works Department of the United Provinces who superintended the excavations carried out at Sarnath in the winter of 1904-05, in the area to the south of a large temple, designated as the Main Shrine in the publications of the Archaeological Department. This temple presumably marks the very spot where Gautama Buddha actually sat to deliver his first sermon for which Sarnath has been so famous through the centuries. Originally, however, the statue must have occupied a much lower level than that on which it was discovered.

The umbrella was found broken in ten pieces which have been joined together. As will appear from the photograph, the umbrella assumes the shape of a full-blown lotus flower, in which the central raised portion represents the fruit. Around this is a ring of the petals ■ that flower and another row of them around the outer rim. The intervening space is taken up by a band of semi-fabulous animals with the heads ■ a buffalo, a goose, an elephant etc. and a broader ring containing twelve sacred symbols, including the three jewels (*Triratna*), namely, the Buddha, the Sacred Law and the Church, the lucky pair of fish, the vase with foliage, the conch, *Svastika* etc.

4. The Buddhist temple at Bodhi Gaya, as restored in modern times. The temple marks the spot where Gautama Buddha attained spiritual wisdom under a *pipal* tree, a descendant of which is still shown at the back of the temple.

5. A well-preserved sculpture representing Buddha in the act of preaching his First Sermon at Sarnath. The wheel in the middle of the pedestal symbolizes the good doctrine discovered by the Blessed One, and the deer on either side of it, the Deer Park, the ancient name of Sarnath. Of the seven figures carved on both sides of the wheel, the three to the right, together with the two adjoining the wheel on the opposite side, are the five monks, to whom the sacred law was first revealed. The other two figures presumably represent the donors of the statue. The sculpture dates from the Gupta period.

6. A Gandhara sculpture probably representing the reception of the Buddha by the Sakyas. The Buddha is seated in the centre, with the King to the left and the Queen to the right. The concentric bands above also represent the Buddha attended by votaries while a line of Gandharvas appears outside the rope pattern.

7. Stone Stele. This sculpture 4'5" high, and surmounted with a little stupa, which has lost its umbrella (*hti*). The front face of the sculpture is divided into four panels representing the four principal events of the life of Gautama Buddha, i.e., his birth at the Lumbini Garden (modern Rummindei in Nepal), his enlightenment at Bodhi Gaya near Gaya, his first sermon at the Mrigaḍava or Deer Park (modern Sarnath near Benares), and his death (*Parinirvana*) at Kusanagara (modern Kasia, District Gorakhpur). These four places are sacred with the Buddhists and one of the Buddha's last exhortations to his chief disciple Ananda was that his followers should pay regular visits to them. The scene of the Buddha's birth is delineated in the lowest panel where we see his mother, Mayaḍevi, standing under a *sala* tree. To her proper left stood her sister Prajapati (now much defaced) and further to the left the infant Bodhisattva receiving his first bath from two Naga deities Nandā and Upanandā. On the other side of Mayaḍevi was carved a figure ■ Indra or Sakra who received the infant as soon as he was born. The second panel from the bottom represents the temptation of the Bodhisattva at Bodhi Gaya by the Evil One (Mara) corresponding to Kama of the Hindu mythology. The threats and enticements of the Tempter having failed, the sage attained supreme wisdom the same night and thenceforward became known as *Samyak-sambuddha* or truly enlightened. In the relief we see the Master seated in the *bhūmisparsa-mudra* under a *pipal* tree, with Mara holding his usual bow in his left hand standing to his proper right, and two ■ Mara's daughters standing to his left. The two uncouth figures in the upper corners of the composition, one brandishing his sword and the other threatening the sage with an upraised finger, are two of the demoniacal followers of the Evil One. The figure standing behind Mara is one of his attendants who holds his crocodile standard (*makara*-

dhvaja), while the one seated in despair in front of him is the Evil One himself after his defeat. The next upper panel represents Buddha seated in the *dharmacakra-mudra* symbolizing his first sermon at Sarnath, which is described in Buddhist texts as the turning of the wheel ■ the good law or doctrine discovered by the Buddha. This wheel is clearly seen beneath the throne of the Master, the six figures seated on both sides of it being the first five converts (*Panchabhadravargiya*) and an additional figure, possibly meant to represent the donor ■ the sculpture. The scene at the top of the relief is the great decease ■ the Buddha, who is lying on his right side in accordance with the texts. The figures seated in front of the couch include one of the Tridandi recluse, Subhadra, of Kusanagara, who was the last to embrace the Buddhist faith in the lifetime of the Master. The figure adoring the feet of the Buddha is Mahakasyapa of Rajagriha and those behind the Buddha, human and celestial mourners including the female spirits of the two *sala* trees under which the demise took place.

The sculpture must have been an object of worship in one of the sanctuaries of Sarnath and its date is determined by a short inscription engraved on the back of the slab in characters of the Gupta period. The inscription contains the well-known Buddhist formula *ye dharma hetu-prabhava* etc. Asvajit, the fifth disciple of Buddha had been questioned by Upatissa, who afterwards became known as Sariputta, as to what the doctrine of his teacher was and he replied,

" Of all the phenomena sprung from a cause,
The Buddha the cause has told
And he tells too how each shall come to its end.
Such alone is the word of the Sage."

8. Gandhara sculpture representing the coffin ■ the Buddha before cremation at Kusanagara (modern Kasia), found at Yusufzai; now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

9. Slab illustrating the eight great events of the Buddha's career. The scene in the lower left corner portrays the birth ■ the Master, and that at the lower right corner his temptation by Mara and his subsequent enlightenment (*bodhi*) at Bodhi Gaya. The First Sermon is depicted in the upper left and the *Parinirvana* or death in the fourth corner. The intervening panels illustrate the four principal miracles performed by the Buddha. Of these, the panel immediately below the representation of the First Sermon shows the Master's descent from the Heaven ■ the thirty-three Gods (*Trayastrimsa*), whither he had himself ascended to preach his doctrine to his deceased mother Maya and then come down by a ladder of precious substances to Sankasya (modern Sankisa in the Farrukhabad District). The figures to his right and left are Brahma, identified by his *kamandala*, and Indra respectively. The subject depicted

next below is the presentation of honey by a monkey in the Parileyyayka forest near Vaisali or Kausambi, to which the Master had temporarily retired on account of quarrels among his disciples. In the panel to the right, we recognise the subjugation of the infuriated elephant (Nalagiri) which had been let loose at the Master at Rajagriha, at the instigation of Devadatta, the wicked cousin of the Buddha. The eighth event, the miracle of Sravasti (modern Saheth-Maheth on the borders of the Gonda and Bahraich Districts) occupies the panel below the *Parinirvana* scene. This miracle was performed by the Buddha to subdue his six adversaries (Pirithyas) and consisted in the Master walking in the air in various attitudes, while emitting alternately flames and waves of water from his person, and multiplying images of himself, up to the heaven and in all directions.

The sculpture dates from the late Gupta period and was found at Sarnath.

10. A remarkable sculpture of the Gandhara school (1st or 2nd century A.D.) representing Buddha as an ascetic. It depicts the Bodhisattva engaged at Bodhi Gaya in a severe austerity to attain supreme knowledge, which, however, did not come to him, according to the story, until he had abandoned the practice of self-torture. The sculpture is 2' 8½" high. It was excavated from the ruins of a monastery at Sikri in 1889 and is now preserved in the Lahore Museum.

11. Mediæval image in Magadha style showing Gautama Buddha at the moment of his enlightenment. Observe the *pipal* foliage at the top and the oval halo, distinctive of the Bihar sculptures. Now in the Indian Museum, Calcutta.

12. *Kanishka bronze casket*.—This casket was found by Dr. D. B. Spooner of the Archaeological Survey of India in 1908-09 in the great Stupa of the Kushan king Kanishka, now locally known as Sha-ji-ki-Dheri near the city of Peshawar. The casket is 5" in diameter and 4" in height from the base to the edge of the lid. The latter is crowned by a seated figure of Buddha with a standing Bodhisattava figure on either side. The three smaller objects to the right of the casket in the photograph are, beginning from the right, a six-sided crystal reliquary, a clay sealing with the device of an elephant standing to right, with which the reliquary was originally closed, and a copper coin of Kanishka. The crystal reliquary contained three small pieces of bone, undoubtedly the original relics of Gautama Buddha which were deposited by Kanishka in his stupa.

The casket is decorated by incised lotus-petals on the top of the lid, a row ■ flying geese (*hansas*) round the lower edge of the lid and a series of three-seated Buddhas supported, as it were, by a long undulating garland upheld by little Erotes, with larger worshipping figures at

intervals, round the body of the casket. The group in front of the photo shows the king Kanishka himself attended by a figure of the Moon to his right and one of the Sun to his left.

There are four short Kharoshthi inscriptions incised in dotted characters: (1) on the top of the lid, (2) between the figures of the geese, (3) between the heads of the figures in the frieze round the body of the casket and (4) between the feet of the same figures. The first inscription records the dedication of the relics to the teachers of the school of the Sarvastivādins, a sect of the Hinayana. The inscription between the geese means, "May this pious gift be for the welfare and happiness of all creatures." The fourth inscription is the most important of all the four epigraphs, as it tells us that a certain Greek named Agisala (or Agislaos) was the officer-in-charge of the construction of the Vihara or stupa of Kanishka at or in the vicinity of Mahasena's monastery. The inscription is so arranged that the name Kanishka occurs immediately to the right and left of his feet.

The discovery establishes the identity of the Shah-ji-ki-Dheri mound near Peshawar as the stupa of Kanishka and has supplied three authentic pieces of Gautama Buddha's own corporeal remains. These relics were presented by the Government of India to the Buddhists of Burma and are now kept in a pagoda at Mandalay.

13. A fine sculpture exhibiting Kubera or Vaisravaṇa, the God of Wealth, and his consort Haritī seated on a throne. Gandhara work, (1st or 2nd century A.D.); found at Sahri-Bahlol, District Peshawar.

14. A green faience seal found at Mohanjodaro. The photograph has been taken from an enlarged drawing. The scene on the obverse of the tablet shows a male figure seated on a throne attended by a human votary with a serpent (*Naga*) on either side. Circa. 3,000 B.C.

15. A square tablet, representing a Brahmani bull with a large flowing dewlap, and characterised by a remarkable accuracy of anatomical detail. Above the animal is a legend in pictographic characters. Circa. 3,000 B.C.

16. Medallion on Bharhut Stupa showing an animated representation of the Mahakapi-Jataka. In one of his previous existences Gautama Buddha was the lord of a large tribe of monkeys which lived on the bank of the Ganges and enjoyed the fruit of a great mango tree. King Brahmadatta of Benares besieged the spot to drive the monkeys away. The Bodhisattva monkey then stretched his body in the form of a bridge across the river and thus enabled his followers to escape into safety. His jealous cousin, Devadatta, however, who was in that life one of this tribe of monkeys, jumped on the Bodhisattva, while he was still stretched across the river, and wounded him mortally. The king was moved by the good

act of the great monkey and gave him royal obsequies. They are seen conversing with each other in the lower part of the panel.

17. A richly sculptured slab, one of a series ■ slabs which surrounded the base ■ the Amaravati Stupa (Circa. 1st century B.C.). The relief represents a Dagoba (Sanskrit, *Dhatugarbha*) complete with drum, dome and *Mi*, flanked on either side by a sculptured pillar, surmounted by a wheel which is supported on the backs of lions and represents the Buddhist Law ■ Piety. The Stupa is ornamented with elaborate friezes exhibiting Jataka scenes, or scenes from the Buddha's previous existences. Around the base is a railing which is meant to be pierced with entrances at the four cardinal points. As should be expected, only one of these entrances is seen in the sculpture and shows in front of the Stupa a scene illustrating the worship of the wheel of *Dharma*. The spandrels on both sides of the dome contain divine figures in flight, holding "chauris," umbrellas, etc.

18. *The Karla Chaitya*.—This plate represents the Chaitya hall attached to the cluster of Vihars on the Poona Lonavala road about ten miles from the latter. It is cut out of a rock which formed the spur of a hill towering 500 feet above the plain near the modern village of Karla which has given it the popular name. The hall is 126 feet in length, 46 feet in breadth and the same in height.⁽¹⁾ From the inscriptions still preserved its age has been computed by Mr. James Fergusson to be about a century before the Christian era,⁽²⁾ and is without exception, the largest and finest, as well as the best preserved, of its class. As Fergusson observes, it "was excavated at a time when the style was in its greatest purity. In ■ all the architectural defects of the previous examples are removed; the pillars of the nave are quite perpendicular. The original screen is superseded by one in stone ornamented with sculpture—its first appearance apparently in such a position—and the architectural style had reached a position, that was never afterwards surpassed."⁽³⁾

Fifteen massive pillars, cut from the same rock on each side of the nave form the aisles each ten feet wide. Each pillar has a tall base, an octagonal shaft and richly ornamented capital, on which kneel two figures generally a man and a woman, but sometimes two females, all very much better executed than such ornaments usually are. The sculptures on the capitals supply the place usually occupied by frieze and cornice in Grecian architecture; and in other examples plain painted surfaces occupy the same space. Above this springs the roof, semi-circular in general section, but somewhat stilted at the sides so as to heighten its effect. It is ornamented by wooden ribs, coeval with the excavation.

(1) *Journal R.A.S. Journal* (Bombay Branch) (1853-57, pp. 151—157.)

(2) *Epigraphic Indica* (Pt. 7) 325—329.

(3) *History of Indian and Eastern Architecture* (1910) 142—148.

Immediately under the semi-dome of the apse, and nearly where the altar stands in Christian churches, stands the *stupa*, in this instance a plain dome on a two-storeyed circular drum, the upper margin of each section being surrounded by ornamental railings. ■ is surmounted by a capital or tee ■ the usual form, on which stands a wooden umbrella, much blackened by age and smoke, but almost entire. The canopy is circular, minutely carved on the under surface and droops on two sides only, the front and rear. In the top of the capital there is a hole 10 inches deep covered by a slab which held the relic of a local saint since removed.

Light is let in through the entrance comprising three doorways under a gallery surmounted by a grand semi-circular window, and is diffused into the hall and falls on the *stupa* placed exactly opposite the central doorway, while still further, the screens and music galleries built in front and to the scenic effect of the grand panorama.

The gates and pillars bear inscriptions to commemorate the piety of several donors.

The chapel itself is surrounded by numerous cells similarly cut into the rock where the monks spent their *vassa*. These are now in a state of ruins, but nevertheless they bear witness to the vogue which Buddhism had attained so far south, now replaced by Animism, the symbol of which the bloody goddess Kali is a central figure of an unshapely shrine constructed in the vestibule in whose honour a festival is annually held in October, and to which fowls and goats are sacrificed, the Chaitya hall itself being used as a rest-house for the Hindu devotees who visit it for worship.⁽¹⁾


19. A large stone Buddha head found at Sahri-Bahlol, District Peshawar. The head shows the usual protuberance of the skull (*Ushnisha*), the *Urna* mark between the eye-brows and elongated ears (embossed at the back of cover.)

(1) This note is drawn by the Author.

CHAPTER I

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

In order to understand the religious characteristics of a people, we cannot wholly ignore their racial characteristics. As is well-known, ethnologists subdivide the human race into five distinct families—the Caucasian (or white man), the Mongolian (or Tartar), the Negro, the Malay and the North American Indian. Of these, the religions of the world owe their inception to the two great races, the Hindus and the Jews; the former belonging to the Aryan branch of the Caucasian family, and the latter to the Semitic branch of the same. The following table illustrates their relationship:—



The Hindus have given birth to two great religions—Hinduism and Buddhism, of which the latter cannot be understood without some knowledge of Hinduism and its sacred literature, which embraces every form of thought in which the law of contradiction is a dead letter. The population of India,

as of the followers ■ Hinduism, is ■ mixed population ; those in the north being of Aryan extraction from those who entered India from the Western passes, whereas the Kolarians who penetrated it from the North-eastern passes are now represented by the lowly civilized inhabitants of Chota Nagpur : the other immigrants are the Dravidians, who occupy the southern peninsula, and are represented by the Telugu, Tamil and Malabar.

We are here concerned only with the Aryan immigrants, whose incursion appears to have ceased by 1,500 B.C. They found the country occupied by the Turanian natives who had displaced the aborigines, but who easily yielded to the superior force of the new invaders. There were thus three distinct types of people when the last of the Aryan incursions ceased : the late arrivals who were of fair complexion, the past immigrants who, though of Aryan stock, had by their inter-marriages with the aborigines lost their colour; and the aborigines who were of a low negroid extraction. Upon giving up his nomadic character and settling down in village communities to the pursuit of agriculture and commerce, the first thing, that the new conqueror had to do, was to preserve the purity of his blood.

The three chief occupations of life—war, religious worship and trade—had already given rise to the three classes,—of warriors, priests and traders, which in course of time became hereditary and stereotyped into the three main castes of Kshatriyas, Brahmans and Vaishyas; and these, being all of the new invaders and subject to common communal and religious discipline, were an outward symbol of their unity—"the sacred thread"—the initiation of which became afterwards as important a ritual as even marriage. It was, in reality, ■ mark of public acknowledgment and confirmation of the youth in the privileged rank of the Aryan—and he was, therefore, called ■ "Dwij" or "twiceborn." Below them stood the Turanian lowlanders, who were admitted into the fourth order as Shudras and who were artisans and labourers ; while the aborigines, who were outcasts and outside the pale of organized society, were, some of them treated as serfs or slaves and assigned menial occupations, and many of them were driven southwards. This system was in some

degree justified by its practical utility ; since the three higher castes naturally served the same purpose as guilds or trade-unions of modern times. In course of time each caste became self-contained, and inter-dining and inter-marriages were proscribed. The priests found this arrangement so convenient that they traced its origin to divine appointment ; and a myth explained how—as animals had been created in various classes, so too Brahma had created the four castes—the Brahman from his mouth, to teach men ; the Kshatriya from his arms, to defend them ; the Vaishya from his stomach, to feed them, and the Shudra from his feet, to serve them—to whom must be added the aborigines who were all classed as Mlenchchhas.

This quintuple sub-division of society was sufficiently rigid, though more elastic than it became in later times, when the orgy of caste led to its multiplication, so that the four castes have now multiplied a thousand-fold, the last census-return mentioning no less than 3,500 well-defined castes and sub-castes, in addition to numerous others, which are not yet so clearly defined.

Each caste possesses its own social autonomy. As a social organization, it is independent of all outside interference. But as all castes owe allegiance to Hinduism, they are expected to acknowledge the supremacy of the Brahmans, and worship one or other of the numerous approved gods of that faith. These gods are no less than 33 crores⁽¹⁾ in number, so that the choice is by no means limited.

In his religious beliefs and observances, the Hindu generally follows the natural bent of his mind, so long as he does not stray outside the fold of his religion by becoming a convert to an alien faith, *e.g.*, Mahomedanism or Christianity. If he joins the numerous allied, though openly hostile, sects *e.g.*, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Brahmoism, or becomes a member of the Arya Samaj, he does not cease to be a Hindu, the reason being that all these religions and cults owe their authority or their existence to the force of either Hindu religion or its philosophy ;—the two were never looked apart, both being classed under the heading “*Dharm*” or Duty, as embracing both discursive knowledge and dogma.

⁽¹⁾ One crore equals Ten Millions.

The growth of Hinduism is a growth, not by the process of evolution but by that of accumulation. No tenet once propounded is abandoned; only another tenet is propounded and placed alongside of it, as an equally authoritative revelation or exposition—the result being that tenets, diametrically opposing and self-contradictory, equally claim to owe their authority to the same infallible source. Though it does not authorise eclecticism and free discussion, it does not nevertheless proscribe or punish the holding of an opinion, however subversive of its theology.

The fact is that though the Hindu has still to pay his lip-courtesy to the Vedas as embodying his religion, he has wholly deserted all its gods who are all obsolete and superseded by the Puranic gods of the post-Vedic period. The literature of this period has been equally subversive of its philosophy. The two together mark an epoch in the religious development and the intellectual growth of the people. On the whole, the Vedic literature marks a purer faith, the Puranic, its base deterioration.

The former alone, which dates from 1,500 to 500 B. C., influenced Buddh; the latter, which dates from 400 B.C. to 600 A.D., had assisted in its corruption. These two epochs mark the deterioration of a positive monotheism into first—nature-worship, then—pantheism, and lastly—idolatry and demon-worship. In the first stage we have a curious dualism of esoteric rationalism combined with exoteric ritualism. Scepticism followed next—of which Buddhism is the finest flower—and in which the ethics of society found their basis in convention and law, rather than in religion. Last appeared polytheism and idolatry, superstition and magic, unbridled immorality and unlimited credulity. These three stages mark the progress of Hinduism, the last two of Buddhism.

The Vedic literature, which culminated in the sceptic philosophy of Kapil and the sceptic religion of Gautam Buddh, comprises the four Vedas, each subdivided into three parts as follows:—

(1) *The Mantras* (1,500-1,200 B. C.) or charms to convey thought—are five collections of hymns and texts of praises and

prayers, addressed to the personified forces of nature ; e.g., Indra (Thunder) ⁽¹⁾, Agni (Fire) ⁽²⁾, Varun (the Sky) ⁽³⁾, Mitra (the friend i.e., the Sun) ⁽⁴⁾. They constitute the first division of the Veda and are classed as *S'ruti* or "Direct Revelation", of which the principal collection is the Rig Veda containing 1,017 hymns. They contain no references to castles, images or temples or to the doctrines of Karm and the transmigration of the soul. They, however, prescribe elaborate forms of sacrifices of horses, bulls and goats and contain even a reference to human sacrifice. Buddha lost no opportunity in inveighing against their worthlessness.

(2) *The Brahmins*.—The Mantras are all in metre, while Brahmins, which followed (1,000-800 B.C.) ⁽⁵⁾, are prose-works appended to them, descriptive of the ceremonial necessary for each sacrifice, to be performed by the Brahmins, who are alone the medium of salvation—which is described as an absorption in the Divine Essence ; while there is a faint allusion to the doctrine of transmigration of souls and the doctrine of Karm to which it is subject. *The sacrifice substituted for men is that of horses, bullocks, goats and sheep.*

(3) Alongside of the Brahmins were composed the Upanishads,—also works in prose, numbering about 235, the oldest of which preceded Buddhism. They develop the doctrine both of psychology and ontology, postulating the eternal existence of souls, which like the Brahm. have had neither a beginning nor an end, but acquire consciousness when linked to a material body ; and this partnership of the two incongruous elements is the prime source of suffering and sorrow which continues so long as, following the Law of Causation, the chain of births and re-births continues,—the soul passing through higher or lower existences according to its action (which is the Law of Karm) until, after its sublimation by virtuous acts, it attains to a higher life and eventually reaches the stage of sublimity, when re-births cease and the soul becomes re-absorbed in the supreme Brahm.

(1) *Dyau* (Heaven) or *Dyau-Pitar* (Heavenly Father). "Zeus of Greece ; *Dies-pitar*,—then Jupiter of Rome. *Aditi* (Space or Nature) personified as a goddess.

(2) *Surya*—the Sun-god, *Indra* and *Agni* were the Vedic triad's.

(3) *Ouranos* (*Plutus*) of Greece ; *Ahura Mazda* of Zoroastrianism.

(4) *Mithra* of the Persians.

(5) *Upanishads* 1 S. B. E., I.XVII.

This speculation became the fruitful fountain of vigorous heresies. Buddhists speak of sixty-four systems of heresy which they discussed and dismissed; but Hindus only recognize six schools of philosophy the *Shat Shastras* ("The six Instruments of True Knowledge") which are ((1) The Sankhya, (2) Yoge, (3) Mimansa, (4) Vedant, (5) Nyay, and (6) Vaisheshik, a supplement to the Nyay. Of these, the Mimansa and the Vedant relate to rituals, Yoge to Abstraction, and Nyay and its supplement deal with Logic. The two systems of outstanding distinction were the Sankhya, the Sceptic system, and the Nastik or Nihilist system which was contemptuously left unclassified. There were those, who, while admitting the existence of souls, denied the existence of Brahm; while there were others who denied the existence of both. The one created the Sankhya school of which Kapil is the reputed founder, the other a school of *Nastiks*, of which Charvak and Ajit were the principal protagonists. All these systems and their off-shoots between themselves covered every possible line of thought.

It is at this stage of Hindu thought that Gautam was born; he unravelled the speculations of each school and reached a result which he embodied in his own doctrine, to which reference will have to be made later on.

The school of Buddhism was followed by the Puranic period—a period, of which the mouthpiece was the Bhakti-Shastras, which, while rejecting the sacrifices of the Vedas, held salvation as attainable not only by *Ved* (Knowledge), or *Karm* (actions, good deeds), but equally by *Bhakti* (love or devotion to the gods). The idea of Love was carried to a further limit by the *Tantras* ⁽¹⁾ which are dialogues between Shiv and his consort—*Shakti* and teach magical and mystical formularies for the worship of the deities or the attainment of super-human power. Both these sets of writings adopt the *Sankhya* division of Creation into two primordial elements, the *Purush* (the Person, the Ego, the Soul) and *Prakriti* (the matter or body), but turn that division to subserve their own purpose. Even in the older Upanishads the *Purush* or Ego was regarded as the active principle and was

(1) *Tantra*—to rule; the principal doctrine.

compared to the male, while *Prakriti* or Nature was regarded as the female recipient of the creative principle. But, since in the beginning there was only the Brahm, He became divided into Brahm and Prakriti, and so evolved a scale of beings which reached from inanimate nature, through vegetable life, animals, men, saints and gods up to the highest manifestation in the Trinity of (1) Brahma, the Creator—whose Guna or special quality is activity, (2) Vishnu, the Preserver, whose Guna or special quality is goodness and (3) Shiv, the destroyer whose Guna is darkness. But since the three are one, and the one has evolved the three, the worship of each is equally meritorious; but in the Tantras, the worship of Brahma disappeared and as the Trinity had to be completed, the two deities were provided with a consort *Shakti* or Energy, who represented the female and afterwards the more active element. The Purans number eighteen ⁽¹⁾ of which some extol Vishnu and his gunas, while others do the same for Shiv; but the majority of them, no less than twelve, place Vishnu above both Brahma and Shiv who are only his manifestations. The Bhagvat Puran (1,200 A.D.) which consists of about 18,000 Shlokas ⁽²⁾ deals exclusively with the glorification of Bhagvat or (the "Lord") Vishnu. Its tenth book narrates in detail the life of Krishna and is probably the best known portion of that or any other Puran. Four Purans favour the cult of Shiv ⁽³⁾. All the Purans appear to belong to the post-Mahabharat age. Many of them refer to it, while most of them copy its episodes and stories; but their primary purpose was to recommend the sectarian cult of Vishnu, though some of them favoured the worship of Shiv. The worship of this latter god was taken up in right earnest by the Tantras already mentioned. These are doubtless later compositions, brought into existence when the controversy between the followers of the two gods had sharpened to a spear-head. They profess to teach the real doctrine, couched in the form of dialogues between Shiv and his consort—*Shakti*, advocating their cult,—some of them showing a distinct bias in favour of Shakti even to the exclusion of Shiv.

⁽¹⁾ Besides these, there are ■ Upapurans which deal with the ritual more than the epic.

⁽²⁾ Metrical couplets.

⁽³⁾ These are the *Skand*; *Shiv*; *Ling*; and *Bhavishya* or *Bhavishyat Puran*.

The popularization of these symbolisms to explain Creation led to the personification of the procreative principle, and it was accompanied by the performance of obscure rites, accompanied by immoral practices. Shiv and Vishnu both became rival deities; the Shivites converted their god, the one time-destroyer, into a Brahm; but this was represented as the Purush and represented by the phallic symbol, while his temple, built in the midst of rivers and tanks, typified the union of *Purush* and *Prakriti* as parents of creation. The rivalry between the worshippers of the two gods soon deepened into two opposing sects—the Shivites and the Vishnavites. Brahm is now forgotten and his worship considered obsolete as being unsuited to the *Kaliyug* (present age). Vishnu takes his place and pervades the universe, as Brahm did to the Vedic sage. He has revealed himself to man in several incarnations, the most complete being Ram and Krishna, whose consorts—Sita and Radha respectively—represent the Shakti elements of Creation. As the Purans inculcate the worship of Vishnu, the Tantras inculcate the worship of Shiv, and latterly of Shakti—which has assumed different forms *e.g.*, Kali (or the Black demon-goddess) in Bengal, and Durga (the wife of Shiv) elsewhere. Shiv had an issue by Durga,—the minor god Ganesh, Ganpati, or Vinayak with the elephant's head provided by the irate father in substitution of the one he had taken off. He is the god of learning and is worshipped all over the country.

Brahmanical speculation, like all speculations, indeed, like all created things, had passed through its three stages of infancy, maturity and decay. Buddhism rose just when Brahmanism, having passed out of its constructive vigour, had entered upon its period of decrepitude. In its first stage, its speculation postulated the existence of a Supreme Spirit—Brahm—and ascribed the creation of the universe to His will. The world was the phantom production of His creative energy. It was a Maya—an illusion produced to the sensual perception of mankind. The universe, being the product of His will, pervaded His soul. All beings were likewise emanations from Him and comprehended His spirit in varying degrees. The vital principle in man was His spirit. As all sentient creation was a manifestation of the

same spirit, respect for sentient life followed as a necessary corollary. The matter was a grand mechanism for the purification of the soul; its destiny lay in its re-absorption in Brahm. A creed—so universal—could admit of no proselytism. All were creatures of the same Creator. All were tending towards the same goal. It was the supreme attainment of human effort. A thin veneer of the ethical doctrine overlay this abstruse cosmogony. It was followed by an expansion which marked its final decadence.

The present day Hinduism is reduced to the worship of Ram, Krishna, Shiv and Kali, though other minor gods also receive their due share of reverence.

Hindu religion has thus passed from Animism to Monotheism, thence to Pantheism, and after over 1,500 years of Scepticism systematized by Buddhism, it has now degenerated into an idol-worship and conventional ritualism, in which the form is regarded as everything, and its substance as nothing. The orthodox Hindu, still adhering to the *Sanatan Dharm* ⁽¹⁾ starts his day by repairing to a stream or pool in which he first throws his floral offerings to propitiate the Spirit of water; he then rinses his mouth and bathes his body, then bends knee-deep in water and prays, standing first on the right leg and then on the left; he then turns round and bows to the four quarters of the compass, and then filling his water-pot, he turns to the rising sun and pours out its water as his libation to that deity. If he is more devout, or has time, or has taken a vow, or has to make a special prayer, he makes an idol out of the earth, taken from the bed of the river, to which he prays; which done, he immerses it again and then leaves the stream, to follow his usual occupation. Those who can afford it, employ Brahmans to officiate for them; and sometimes assisted by the worshipper or without him, they go through the same ritual which is held conducive to the same end.

From this necessarily rapid survey of the evolution of Hinduism and its doctrine, it will be apparent that Hinduism had already outlived its zenith of purity and excellence, some centuries before Buddhism arose to accelerate its downfall. Its pristine

(1) *Sanatan*—everlasting, old ancient; hence the Orthodox.

stage of metaphysical purity had already closed when the corrupting influence of the priest-craft aroused Gautam from his princely apathy.

The establishment of an Aryan colony amongst the aborigines of darker hue called for the preservation of the unsullied blood of the invader. The easier life of the priest was productive of mental apathy. New weapons were forged to control the masses and reduce them to subservient subjection. The dogma of metaphysics was overlaid with the fungus of falsehood.

The sum-total of the Buddhist attack on Brahmanism was directed against all the following essential points of its oppressive dogma, which had replaced the comparative simplicity of its abstract thought. The crying need of the hour was to restrain, if it be impossible to prevent, the exactions of the priest. It was only possible by challenging their supremacy and assumed sanctity. But this could not be done without attacking the entire net-work of make-beliefs which passed for religion. In the fore-front stood the popular veneration for the Vedas which the Brahmins passed as Revelation; and, as these could be added to or altered at any time to suit the exigency of the occasion, it was the master-key to human deception. Kapil had, of course, previously denied that pretension ⁽¹⁾; but he had stood alone. Buddha was the first to bring its fatuity home to the masses. The Brahmins had invented the doctrine of Mantras—the miraculous power of the formulæ. Its proper intonation wrought miracles, and as this was the privilege of only the Brahmins, all that the laity had to do was to pay them for their recitation, the power of which was greatly heightened by elaborate and costly sacrifices, of which the Vedas prescribed befitting rituals. And in order to produce a pre-disposition and a spirit of hierolatriy, they enjoined *Tapas* (self-torture) and *Yoge* (meditation) on the part of the individual as necessary high-roads to salvation. By these ministrations which it was for the Brahmins to give and the non-Brahmins to receive, they placed themselves even above the gods in the heavens, who were said to live by their sufferance. ⁽²⁾

(1) "The Vedas are not from eternity: for there is scripture for their being a production."

(2) *Vishnu*, XIX-22; 7 S. B. E. 77.

Worship of the Brahman became even more meritorious than the worship of the gods, who trembled before his *Mantras* and his sacrifices, by which he could bring about a revolt in their midst, and the power of *Yoge*—which gave him direct access to Brahman himself.

The conflict between the Aryan and the Non-Aryan, and the traditional conservatism of the people to cling to their vocational pursuits, led to the perpetuation of caste—the combined resultant being an irradicable pessimism which tinged the philosophy, and which was after all the only lesson of life. Buddha accepted its pessimism, of which he was convinced by experience; but he strove hard against all that Brahmanism expressed and implied—the Divine Revelation of the *Vedas*, the force of *Mantras*, the value of sacrifices, *Yoge*, penance or self-torture, the division of society by caste, and above all, the pretensions and assumptions of the Brahmins, their super-divinity, their selfishness and unscrupulous exactions.

The world has never again witnessed the spectacle of its four great teachers being born in different countries about the same time; and, what is more, three of them teaching similar doctrines independently, presumably without knowledge of one another. These were Confucius (551-478 B.C.) and Lao-Tsze (600? B.C.) in China, and Zoroaster (589-539 B.C.) in Persia. Greater than all of them was, of course, Gautama; but the influence of his contemporaries, though limited, was nevertheless considerable; and they have created systems which, as in the case of the Chinese teachers, have proved valuable co-adjuncts to Buddhism; and it is known that Zoroaster's teaching, though limited to Persia, did influence, and was in turn influenced by the Jewish theology; but how far it acted as a link with Buddhism can only be the subject of speculation⁽¹⁾. That Persia was for centuries after the dawn of Buddhism and its extension to Afghanistan, a buffer between Buddhism and Judaism, which disappeared with the subjugation of the Jews and the conquest of Western India, lends plausibility to the theory advanced—that Buddhist influence

(1) Prof. Darmestier refers to the dual influences of Buddhism and Judaism upon the doctrine of Zoroaster, *Zend-Avesta* 4 S.B.E. ■ LIV ch. IV pp. LVII et seq.

had made itself felt in Jewish theology long before the dawn of the Christian era.

Like Buddha, Zarathushtra, better known to the Europeans as Zoroaster, did not claim to be more than a religious reformer. It appears that the ancient religion of the Medes and the Persians was a Vedic form of Hinduism; but in consequence of a religious schism ⁽¹⁾ of which the origin is obscure, the Persians formed a religion of their own in antagonism to the Brahmins, an antagonism which was extended to their gods (*Devas*) whom they adopted in the first instances as the demons; on the other hand, they began to worship the demons of the Brahmins (*Asuras*), as their own gods (*Ahuras*). This was the work of Zoroaster, who appears to have been the descendant of one of the Magis or the hereditary priests of the Medes whose empire the Persians had overthrown. Zoroaster composed the *Zend-Avesta* ⁽²⁾ in four divisions, comprising the hymns and prayers for worship, the sacrificial ritual and a code of law, both religious and civil. The work is only a collection of Zend fragments, and contains either polemics against or loans from the great contemporary systems, the Brahmanical, the Buddhist, the Greek and the Jewish ⁽³⁾; but according to Prof. Darmester its practical and moral ideal revolted against the inert asceticism of Buddhism, the ethical indifference of Brahmanism and the superstitious low worship of immoral *Devas*, while Greece and Palestine on the contrary brought to it novel, fascinating and edifying thoughts ⁽⁴⁾.

Zoroaster was the worshipper of the Sun-god and as *Ahura-Mazda* (Lord-wisdom) or Ormuzd he gave him the first place in his pantheon and with Him were associated certain immortal saints called *Amshaspendas*—personifications of the virtues, which Ormuzd has created in man. Over against Him stood *Ahriman*, the prince of darkness, born of the spirit of Evil (*Angro-Mainya*), who like Lucifer had been driven out of heaven by the victorious angel *Mitra* (the Sun-god), who left his agent—*Indra* to carry on the struggle. The system is founded on the ancient dualism

■ Prof. Darmester doubts the schism—*Zend Avesta* 4 S. B. E. LII.

⁽²⁾ *Zend*—commentary, *Avesta*—text, "Commentary and text," "Annotated Text."

Translated in 4, 23, 31, S. B. E.

⁽³⁾ *Zend Avesta*, 4 S. B. E. LI.

⁽⁴⁾ *Ib.* LXVIII.

of Good and Evil, in which Good will eventually triumph ; but, meanwhile, man must take up the struggle for Good and assist in the extermination of Evil by purity of thought, word and deed, and not by ceremonial purity alone. Honesty and truth are the chief virtues to be cultivated till light overpowers darkness, and the wicked perish in hell and the virtuous rise again in their bodies and experience the eternal bliss of heaven. This doctrine of resurrection was adopted by the Jews and has since passed into Christianity. ⁽¹⁾

Confucius ⁽²⁾ and Lao-Tsze ⁽³⁾ whose teachings bear a closer relationship with Buddhism will be the subject of reference in the sequel. They have both become adjuncts to Buddhism in China, where their doctrines hold currency alongside of that religion.

⁽¹⁾ Jackson's *Zoroaster*, (1899).

⁽²⁾ Translated in 29, 40. S.B.E.

⁽³⁾ Texts translated in 27, ■ S. B. E.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

II

The history of Buddhism is the history of the development of religious thought in India in the sixth and the seventh century before the Christian era. Those centuries will ever be memorable for the Intellectual ferment, created by the close application of human reason to the solution of the great problems of life and death, of the nature and object of the Universe, and in its search for an ultimate cause to explain the riddle of its creation and government. Records of the civilization of man go many centuries before the birth of Gautam Buddha, Confucius and Lao-Tsze. Nor were these centuries wholly devoid of fruitful speculation. The questions, which grip the attention of the modern thinker, had equally engaged the minds of the patriarchal saints, who saw above the starry firmament and found around them the manifestation of life, in every phase of development and at every stage of evolution. But the one thing common to all life is its impermanence. And this was a frailty which even man, the highest and noblest product of earth, shared with the meanest ephemera that live, have their day and die in the twinkling of an eye. Man began naturally to ask why it was that he was so laboriously made and how it was that he so inevitably vanished. High or low, rich or poor, virtuous or wicked, healthy or diseased—they all suffered the same pre-destined fate. Why create life, if it is to be so transient? The beautiful rose, with its ineffable beauty and scent, blossomed in the morning; by the evening its petals were scattered by the wind. Man—the master of Creation, with his work unfinished, had to answer to the same summons of Death. The desire for an eternal life rose within him, as friends were torn off from friends, relations from relations—and some of them even in the hey-day of their lives. Diseases abounded and carried off the young ones no sooner were they born. Was man, then, the victim of a fortuitous concourse of circumstances or was he planned to answer a scheme of Nature? The innate

instinct of all sentient life was to live and not to die. Life how-much-so-ever miserable was preferable to death. The craving to live created a craving for eternal life. The wise found a solace in the belief of a life beyond the grave. It was the only thing man could do. If he could not live here for ever, he could at least hope for such a life hereafter. But how could he live after his body had perished? Or was life something over and above the fragile body in which it became manifest?—These two questionings gave man two solutions: The one—that life was imperishable and survived the perishable body, and the other—that if the perishable body remained, life would return. It gave umbrage to the combined doctrines of immortality and resurrection.

Immortality, the Egyptians argued, was a fact in as much as death was a falsehood, because we have never known it to be true of ourselves, and furthermore, because we will not admit that it can be true of ourselves: "Thou hast departed living, thou hast not departed dead".⁽¹⁾ Hence, if after the physical death we are not dead, we must be alive. Even the suspension of the signs of animation were temporary, and if the body could be preserved, the soul that had flitted from it would certainly return. It led to the mummification of the dead, and the following prayer of the dead envisages the life's longing and its solution, as it occurred to the Egyptian mind over five thousand years ago: "May there be given to thee thy eyes to see; thy ears, to hear what is spoken; thy mouth, to speak; and thy feet, to walk. May thy hands and arms move, and thy flesh be firm. May thy members be pleasant, and mayst thou have joy of all thy births. Mayst thou scanthy flesh (and find it) whole and sound, without any blemish upon thee, thy true heart being with thee, even the heart that thou didst have heretofore"⁽²⁾. The dead returned, but before their return they did not die, but enjoyed beatitude which gave comfort to their bereaved friends: "Of a truth, it is without water, it is without air,—deep, dark, and cold, a place where

(1) *Pyramid Texts*, 124; "Thou diest not," *ib.* 657 etc.

(2) K. Sethe: *Urkunden des ägypt. Altertums*, IV-114 f. (Leipzig.)

one lives in quietude. Pleasures of love are not there ■ be had, nay, but beatitude is given to me in lieu of water and air, and love, quietude in lieu of bread and beer"(1).

But with all this, the Egyptian felt the reality of death which he dreaded. He dared not mention even its name—those dead being merely mentioned as 'those who have gone yonder' or 'gone to the West'. "O ye, who love life and hate death" was the opening formula of the grave-stone. Fully conscious of it, the Egyptian was an epicure and lived up to the moral which he conveyed in his songs: "The nobles and glorified ones..... buried in their pyramids, who built themselves chapels, their place is no more; what is become of them?....." Then comes the inevitable: "Be of good cheer, forget and enjoy thyself. Follow thy heart, so long as thou livest; place myrrh on thy head, clothe thyself with fine linen, anoint thyself, forget sorrow and remember joy, until arrives that day of putting to shore in the land that loveth silence"(2). Indeed, even when the pyramids were erected and the return to life eagerly awaited, there was never absent from the mind the fear that the dead might never return and suffer a "second death in the necropolis"(3). All the same, the Egyptian never gave way to morbid pessimism. In his heart of hearts he did not dismiss from his mind the thought that the dead never rise and that, therefore, the best thing man could do was to make the most of his life.

This cheerful view of life pervades the Greek and Roman philosophers from the earliest times. Almost contemporary with Buddha, Solon gave expression to it in his interview with Croesus. Herodotus describes its details. Solon had visited Sardis where Croesus, the King of Lydia, showed him round his royal palace and his inestimable wealth, after which he asked him whom he considered the happiest man he had ever seen. To the surprise of Croesus, Solon named Tellus of Athens, and when asked to explain his reasons, he said, "Because Tellus

(1) *Book of the Dead* ch. 175.

(2) Epitaph on a Theban Tomb of the priest Nefertopis (V. 114 f. 19th Dynasty); W. Max Müller; *Die Lebersteine der*

alten Ägypter (Leipzig) (1899) pp. 22-27.

(3) *Book of the Dead* Ch. 44, 45; 162, 176, 176.

lived in a prosperous city and was the father of handsome and good sons and saw children born to them all and surviving; and that after a life of affluence, as we count affluence in Hellas, he died a most glorious death, fighting for his country after he had routed its enemies at Elensis, for which he was accorded a public burial where he fell." Croesus then asked him who was the second in happiness. Solon answered—"Cleobis and Biton," who finding that their oxen had not arrived to carry their mother to the Temple of Hera, of which she was the priestess and which she had to attend, as it was the day of a festival, yoked themselves to the waggon and carried her a distance of forty-five stades. Their exertion cost them their lives, for they died at the end of their journey. Croesus was annoyed that Solon had not accorded him even a second place, and said so. But Solon only retorted, "Consider the end of every thing, and call no man happy till he is dead. A man may be fortunate without being happy and happy without being fortunate. It can never be said that he is happy till the sum-total of his life-work is appraised. Life was uncertain and the gods fickle and all one's life-work might be destroyed in a moment."⁽¹⁾

Croesus was annoyed and dismissed Solon without ceremony, considering him a very foolish man, who, overlooking present blessings, bade men to look to the end of everything. But this was the Greek view of life,—as Homer had put it—"Look before and after"—According to Solon, the things that make up human happiness are, adequate endowment of worldly goods, health, beauty of person, prosperous children, and a death in accord with these goods, to which Aristotle would add—good birth and the possession of many good friends,—a friend being defined as "one who, if he considers anything to be good for another, is ready to do it for the other's sake"⁽²⁾, honour and virtue, the four cardinal virtues according to Plato being courage, justice, temperance and wisdom.⁽³⁾

How then, and where shall it be better for the just man? Here and in this life. And this was the prevailing Greek and

(1) *Herodotus*, i. 30, ff.

(2) *Rhetoric*.

■ *Republic*, 427 E.

Hebrew view ■ life, which the Romans adopted. Julius Cæsar, while holding the office of Pontifex Maximus, delivered himself in the Senate, of the doctrine that after death there was no place either for trouble or for joy.

This cheerful conception of life and its obligations finds an echo in the Old Testament, in which it is declared: There are three things which "tend to life": righteousness, ⁽¹⁾ the labour of the righteous, ⁽²⁾ and the fear of the Lord. ⁽³⁾ Those who conform to His will, "live"—that is, enter the new kingdom for ever, and those who disobey, shall "die" i.e. perish in the crisis, being excluded from the kingdom.

It is thus clear that the Jewish and the Western conception of life has always been optimistic, and their philosophy and their popular literature have alike voiced the one cry—"Live and strive"; for there is happiness in life, and life can be made happy, if lived up to the ideal of such life.

But this has never been the conception of the Eastern mind, where unqualified pessimism has found its way both in philosophy and the popular literature of the people. In the Indian philosophy, life was held to comprise a dual element—the perishable body and its "unborn part" ⁽⁴⁾. In the funeral ode in the Rigveda ⁽⁵⁾ a prayer is given that when the body was placed on the funeral pile and the process of cremation had begun, Agni, the god of fire, was prayed not to scorch or consume the departed, not to tear asunder his skin or limbs, but after the flames had done their work, to convey to the ancestors the mortal who had been presented as an offering. His eyes were bidden to go to the sun, while his breath to the wind, and so on; while his unborn part Agni was supplicated to kindle with his heat and flame and convey it to the land of the righteous.

In the pre-Buddhistic Upanishads, the soul was held to exist inside the human body and was the one sufficient explanation of life and motion. In the living body it dwelt in

(1) *Proverbs*, XI-19.

(2) *Ib.* X-16.

(3) *Ib.* XIX. 23.

(4) *Aja bhag* (A-not; Ja-born, bhag-

part)—i.e. "the unborn part."

(5) X.—LXIII-8, X—XVI 1-5; X.—XIV-7.

a cavity of the heart, was material and of the size of a grain of rice or barley. In later speculation, it is said to be of the size of a thumb and in shape like a man and is, therefore, called "the dwarf" within. Its composition was material, being earth, water, fire and ether; but it was by no means certain; since in some of the Sūtras, it was described to be made of consciousness, mind, breath; heat and no heat; desire and no desire; anger and no anger; law and no law, in other words, apperception. The soul was, however, distinct from the body and in sleep it quitted the body and produced dreams, and in body, certain diseases; so that charms had to be employed to recall it. There is also a curious speculation with three variants on the transfer of the soul by generation through the seed. One of them takes the soul after its emergence from the body to the moon where it becomes the food of the gods on account of its good deeds. As soon as the efficacy of these deeds is exhausted, it passes from the gods to the ether, thence into the air, and thence into the rain, thence on to the earth; and from it into plants which become food to males whence they pass into females. The soul of the man whose craving has ceased, goes to Brahm. While the Vedas declare that the release of the soul from its partnership with the body might be secured by sacrifice and penance, the Upanishads declare this impossible. The transit of the soul to the moon is declared as a revolution. It is said to revel in the bright fortnight, but in the dark fortnight it descends into new births in the forms prescribed for it by Karm.

Before the advent of Buddhism, the philosophic thought had already flown into different channels, giving rise to at least six principal schools of philosophy, namely: the Vedānt (also called Uttar Mimāṃsā) founded by Vyāsa, the Mimāṃsā (a commentary on the Vedānt), the Nyāy founded by Gautam, (not Gautam Buddha), the Sāṃkhya founded by Kapil, the Vaiśeṣik founded by Kaṇāḍ and Yoge founded by Patañjali. All, except the Sāṃkhya, proceed upon the supremacy of the Vedas which are recognized both as eternal and as revealed. But this acknowledgment is merely complimentary, since the

Vedas contain no philosophic discussion, being merely concerned with sacrificial rituals and hymns. All these systems expound their principles in *Sūtras* which are classed as only next to the Upanishads and are regarded with almost as much veneration as the Vedas themselves. They are even spoken of as *Vedāntas* ⁽¹⁾ or appendices to the Vedas. Diametrically opposed though some of them are to each other, they are all nevertheless treated as the orthodox commentaries on the Vedic metaphysics. The essence of the Vedic doctrine, so far as it can be gathered from its disjointed references, is pantheism which simply means that God is the universal spirit. It is impassive and impersonal, unconscious and without any attributes⁽²⁾. Three divergent systems fall under the Vedāntic system, namely (a) the *Advait* ⁽³⁾ (Monism), (b) *Dvait* (Dualism), and (c) the *Vishist-Advait* (qualified Monism). The chief exponent of the first is Shankaracharya who flourished in the ninth century; of the second, Madhavacharya of the thirteenth century; while Ramanuj, the protagonist of the third, lived in the eleventh century.

According to the Advait or the monistic system of Vedant philosophy, there is only one existence—the Brahman; the world is an illusion (Maya); or if it exists, it is not distinct from Brahman. The human soul is identical with Brahm—and is in fact Brahm himself; but on account of its connection with the body, it cannot realize that identity. But at death, being freed from the screen of the senses, it will realise that identity. This cardinal doctrine of Vedāntic philosophy that God or Spirit is the only reality, and one with the human soul, asserts itself in almost all Hindu sects, even though their other doctrines may seem to contradict it. For example, the three branches of the Vedant schools are themselves in conflict upon their root-principle. For while the Advait school postulates on a single element, and the Dvaitvadins, though calling themselves Dualists, are really Triolists in that they postulate the existence of three eternal entities—namely, God, the soul and matter, and what is more, they regard every in-

(1) *Veda* "to know," "knowledge" and "lit. (Books) at the end of the Vedas."

(2) *Nirgun-Nir*—without, *Gun*—"qualities."

(3) *A-not*, *Dvait*—second, "No second."

dividual soul distinct and independent of every other soul,—they agree with the Advaitis in holding that the human souls when liberated from the bonds of re-births ⁽¹⁾ will find their utmost bliss in an inseparable union with Brahm. There remains the intermediate school which denies that Brahm is *nirgun* or devoid of attributes, holding him to be omnipresent, omniscient and opposed to all evil. The world and the soul are a distinct and separate emanation of Him. They are real and not a mere illusion. Matter and soul constitute his body. The eventual destination of the souls is no doubt their union in Brahm, but this union does not destroy their individuality.

It will be observed that however widely these schools may differ as to the nature and attributes of Brahm, the world and the soul, they all agree on one vital issue—that the world and the body which the souls inhabit are an obstacle and an impediment to the attainment of their final goal, which is either the absorption by, or the union with, Brahm. As a necessary deduction from this, follows the inutility of corporate life which is the prison-house of the soul, from which its quickest emancipation is the only means of attaining the final goal of existence, with its eternal conscious or unconscious beatitude. This is the main fulcrum of the pessimism of Indian philosophy, and it has overshadowed all speculation aggravated in the Buddhist metaphysics.

Both systems of philosophy—those of the East and of the West—proceed on the main quest of happiness, and they both offer a solution. The Western thought which refuses to link the present with the past or future lives, looks forward to that eternal happiness in resurrection, the East finds the same solution in absorption. To the one, this life being the only one possible, must be lived well, extracting out of it such happiness as it is possible to secure in the admittedly imperfect and transitory world; to the other, the attachment to life creates yearning for its continuance which results in re-births and elongation of the chain of precarious existences,

(1) *Lit. Sansar* i.e., "The world," "Corporate bodies."

lengthening the distance between the soul and its true objective.

The other systems of Hindu thought the Nyay and Vaisheshik, Yoge and Purv Mimansa, equally accept the same objective, though they differ in details. The Vaisheshik school is the atomic school founded by Kanād. It teaches that matter consists of atoms ⁽¹⁾ which are individually indestructible, though when combined, they are liable to decompose. The Yoge prescribes the method for earthly union with God. It provides for the life of mental detachment from all earthly surroundings and concentration of the mind upon Brahm which insures its union even when the soul remains imprisoned in the body. The system which strikes an original line of its own and deviates materially from the Vedantic system is the school of Sankhya philosophers, founded by Kapil and systematized by the grammarian Patanjali, author of the Sankhya Sutras, compiled some four hundred years after the birth of Buddhism; but it is, of course, pre-Buddhistic; and it is the one system to which Buddhism is said to be beholden for its distinctive doctrines.

But very little examination of these systems shows their loose affinity and wider differences. It is not now ascertainable when Kapil founded his school, but it must have been several centuries before the dawn of Buddhism; for Buddh had been to the teachers of that system to resolve his doubts on the value of life. The Sankhya has certainly this fact in common with Buddhism that it evolves its system independently of Brahm. But neither the Sankhya nor any of the established schools of orthodox philosophy have any ethical nexus. They are all individualistic and solely concerned with the one relationship of man to God—the relationship of man to man is a purely Buddhistic innovation. The Sankhya system, as it existed before Buddhism, was probably a system well-evolved; but the only treatise now available is a short poem of seventy verses—the Sankhya Karika and a short tract, the Tattva Samas, which contains nothing more than an enu-

(1) *Anu*—small and *Svaraś*—dots.

meration of topics as the most ancient formulary. The term *Sankhya* itself implies enumeration, in allusion to the predilection of the school for numbered lists,—a predilection noticeable in early Buddhism.

To begin with, the *Sankhya* professes ignorance, if it does not actually deny the existence, of a personal supreme deity, contending that whatever exists must be either bound or free, and God can be neither ⁽¹⁾. It is inconceivable that He should be bound, nor can He be free, since freedom implies the absence of desire and hence of the impulse to create. Again, if God is perfect He can have no need to create a world. It is impossible that He should have created it out of selfishness or kindness. For if His motive was selfish, it is a blot on His perfection; if kindness, the world with its suffering disproves it. Why should He have created beings, who when non-existent had no suffering, but who when created had to experience suffering? A benevolent deity ought to create only happy creatures, not a mixed world like the one we see. "There is no such thing as the 'Creator' and the 'Created': the two are the same." ⁽²⁾

Having thus eliminated the intervention of God, it rests its theory of Creation on the assumption that there exist, uncreated and from all eternity, two entities, one—matter and the other—individual souls. "Everything except Nature and Soul is un-eternal ⁽³⁾". "Soul is, because there is no proof that it is not ⁽⁴⁾". "Soul is eternal ⁽⁵⁾". "Soul is not material. It is something else than the body ⁽⁶⁾". It has not Intelligence as its attribute, because it is without quality ⁽⁷⁾". The world, as we know it, is the product of the evolution of matter. Matter attracts souls, and the two when united create a bondage resulting in suffering, from which the soul tries to wrest itself free. The suffering is inevitable in the union of the two incompatible entities; since the soul, which is ethereal and unchangeable, feels a natural repulsion to be united with matter,

(1) *Sankh. Pravac.* I—92—95; V—46.
Sankhya Aphorisms; (Mr. Ballantyne)
(T. O. S.) pp. 113-114.

(2) *Sankh. Pravac.* I—118. p. 138.

(3) *Sankhya Aphorisms*, V—72 p. 373.

(4) *Sankhya Aphorisms*, V—1, p. 419.

(5) *Ib.*, I—139, p. 159; V—72, p. 373.

(6) *Ib.*, V—139, 141, 142, 143, pp.
159-161.

(7) *Ib.*, I—146, p. 164.

which is constantly changing, and from which it parts company the moment it acquires discriminating knowledge that it is not matter. Thus separated, it attains eternal peace.

It is not the fulfilment of a hope, since "He who ■ without hope is happy, like Pingal;"⁽¹⁾ and it is only "Someone somewhere is happy:"⁽²⁾ that is, there is no such thing as eternal happiness; it is conditioned by environments.

The system is founded on dualism, the eternal antithesis between soul and matter, called Purush⁽³⁾ or the Ego and Prakriti⁽⁴⁾ or Matter. It denies the Vedāntic assertion that the world is a mere emanation of Brahm, holding in its strictest sense that *ex nihilo nihil fit*. Matter can only be produced from matter, and really speaking, there is no such thing as creation but only manifestation of matter in a modified form (Vikriti). Thus, if clay is made into ■ pot, the cause is not the potter but the clay, and the effect or product is nothing else than cause in another shape; production is only manifestation, and destruction is the resolution of a product into its cause. If clay is converted into a pot, it is clay still; and ■ the pot is broken and the materials ground down, it is still clay. The fact is that the clay never ceased and the pot never came into existence and then ceased. It was clay all the time, only it had undergone certain changes. But the Buddhist phenomenalism did not accept this view, holding as it did, that there is no such thing as existence: all is only becoming. The Sankhyas, on the other hand, hold that there is existence and what is called becoming is merely the successive manifestations of that real existence.

This tendency to evolution, inherent in matter, is due to its three-fold qualities (*Guns*)⁽⁵⁾, namely—goodness; passion and movement; and darkness—called *Sattva*, *Rajas*, and *Tamas* ⁽⁶⁾, qualities of matter respectively: of which *Rajas* as much predominates in man as *Sattva* and *Tamas* predominate in gods and

(1) Pingal was a courtesan who gave up all hopes of getting a lover and was then happy. *Sankhya Aphorisms*, IV—11, p. 292.

(2) *Ib.*, VI—7, p. 424.

(3) *Purush*—person, the Ego; *relic of the older "Dwarf"* refer to *ante*,

(4) *Prakriti*—Matter.

(5) *Guns*—Attributes, qualities, peculiarities.

(6) *Sattva*—true, good, happy; *Rajas*—passion, emotion; *Tamas*—darkness.

demons. But so long as the three *Guns* are in equilibrium, matter (*Prakriti*) ■ dormant and remains unmanifested; but the moment their equilibrium is disturbed and one of the *Guns* becomes preponderant, the process of manifestation begins. This disturbance caused in the Soul (*Purush*), is purely mechanical, being due to their proximity and not to volition, like the attraction of a magnet for iron ⁽¹⁾. This mechanical attraction causes a movement which takes at first the form of development and later, of decay and death. Matter then returns to its normal quiescence, till it is again disturbed by the *Purush*, when it re-starts upon its world-making, dissolution and quiescence in succession.

This manifestation of matter is subject to twenty-five principles (*Tattvas*). When evolution begins, it first produces consciousness or intellect (*Buddhi*), then *Ahankar* or individuality and then the five *Tanmatras* or subtle elements which are the essences of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell, to which must be added the five organs of sense namely, ears, skin, eyes, tongue and the nose, (to which is added the sixth—mind), five organs of action—namely, voice, hands, feet, organs of generation and excretion and five gross elements namely, earth, water, light, air and ether. These elements fall under two main sub-heads, viz., the gross and the subtle body, the latter comprising *Buddhi* and the rest, down to the subtle elements, which taken together form the *Purush* or the Soul, migrating from one *Prakriti* (corporeal body) to another and its action on that body determines its future and is thus the law of Karm (or action). In it are embedded the *Sanskars* or the actions producing pre-dispositions, which pass from one existence to another and are latent in a new born mind like seeds in a field.

Therefore, what passes from one body to another upon its re-birth is not the soul (*Purush* or Ego), but only its subtle elements. Equally what perishes with the body is not the soul or its subtle elements—but only matter. Equally again, what rejoices or suffers in life is not the soul but matter, though

(1) *Sankh Prañc.* I—96.

while matter ■ undergoing that manifestation, an illusion that it is the soul that rejoices or suffers is present, just as an illusion of red colour ■ produced in the crystal through which one views a red flower.

It is the task of the soul to free itself from these illusions, which it cannot do until it frees itself from the bondage of matter. What then becomes of it? It is not absorbed in the Brahm, because there is no Brahm to receive it. The answer is as follows: "No soul is bound or is liberated or transmigrates. It is Prakriti, which has many bodily forms, which is bound, liberated and which transmigrates⁽¹⁾. It must not be supposed that the dualism of mind and matter produces any real conflict between the two. The seeming conflict is due to their different qualities; while the soul is unchangeable, matter is constantly changing. But for all that, matter does not act in antagonism to the soul. It rather assists the soul in its liberation. It is likened to a woman who "as a dancer, after showing herself on the stage ceases to dance, so does Prakriti cease when she has made herself manifest to the soul.....Generous Prakriti, endowed with *Guns*, causes by manifold means, without benefit to herself, the benefit of the soul, which is devoid of *Guns* and makes no return"⁽²⁾—that is, the soul when once made conscious of its detachment from matter, the latter ceases to exist so far as that soul is concerned, though it continues the play for other souls who have not attained the same consciousness. It is like a continuous play where the souls come and go—those satisfied withdraw, while others stay on. The former have obtained their release from matter (*Moksha*), which the Buddhists call *Nirvan*, with this difference—that while in the Sankhya, this release is not possible so long as the soul and matter remain outwardly coupled, the Buddhists take the release complete as soon as the soul has withdrawn, though the by-play of life may continue, with this contingency, however, still present in the case of those who stay on—that the soul's

(1) *Sankh. Kar.* 62.

(2) *Sankh. Kar.* 59-61.

liberation ■ conditional and not complete till death. It is the difference between sleep and death.

This *conditional* liberation made the alliance of Buddhism with Yoge possible ; since Yoge suggested mental abstraction as the means to secure its detachment from the body, and this the Buddhists translated into the *Dhyan* or meditation which in its several stages insured the severance, till it reached the stage of Nirvan. Buddh himself had practised it at the moment of his death: "Then the Venerable One entered into the first stage of meditation ; and rising out of the first stage, he passed into the second, and rising out of the second, he passed into the third ; and rising out of the third, he passed into the fourth, and rising out of the fourth stage, he attained the conception of the infinity of space ; and rising out of the conception of the infinity of space, he attained the conception of the infinity of intelligence ; and rising out of the infinity of intelligence, he attained the conception of absolute non-entity ; and rising out of the idea of non-entity, he entered the region where there is neither consciousness nor unconsciousness ; and rising out of that region, he entered the state in which all sensation and perception of ideas had wholly ceased." (1)

This state is *not* death, though it is seemingly so. In fact, when the Blessed One had reached that state, the Venerable Anand cried out to the Venerable Aniruddh : " O My Lord Aniruddh, the Blessed One is dead." Aniruddh corrected him. There are some more stages to go through before the Soul is finally liberated from its earthly tie.

" Then the Blessed One, passing out of the state in which both sensations and ideas have ceased to be, entered into the state between consciousness and unconsciousness. And passing out of the state between consciousness and unconsciousness, he entered into the state of mind to which nothing at all is specially present ; and passing out of the consciousness of no special object, he entered into the state of mind to which the infinity of thought is alone present ;

(1) *Part Nirvan Sutta*, VI—11 ; 11 S. B. E. 114, 115.

and passing out of the consciousness of the infinity of thought, he entered into the state of mind in which the infinity of space is alone present; and passing out of the mere infinity of space, he entered into the fourth stage of deep meditation; and passing out of the fourth, he entered into the third; and passing out of the third, he entered into the second; and passing out of the second, he entered into the first; and passing out of the first stage of meditation, he entered into the second; and passing out of the second stage, he entered into the third; and passing out of the third stage, he entered into the fourth stage of deep meditation; and passing out of the last stage of deep meditation, he immediately expired." (1)

The obligation of Buddhism to the Sankhya system is, therefore, clear. Buddhism is by no means the exponent of that system. While it accepts some of its dogmas, it equally rejects the others. For example, while it accepts the agnosticism of Kapil, it cannot subscribe to his dualism, nor is it prepared to accept his bald concatenations, but builds upon them the solid structure of its own ethics.

Both the Sankhya and the Buddhist systems have however, taken Vedantism for their basis. They are like two streams that, after flowing into the Vedantic channel, have burst its banks and cut for themselves new channels; and, after taking an independent course for some distance, become re-united with the main stream from which they had become parted.

In adopting this course, it must not be supposed that Buddhism had acted in ignorance. For there were those who opposed the orthodox tenets root and branch, and boldly asserted that there was no life but this life, and it was foolish not to make the most of it. Charvak was the founder of this school, though his views can now be gathered only from references to him by his opponents, still they are sufficiently pronounced to have brought down upon him the powerful battery of Brahmanical orthodoxy. Charvak claimed for his

(1) *Pari Nirvan Sutta*, VI—13; 11 S. B. E. 115, 116.

views equally divine inspiration. They are expressed in the following lines spoken by Brihaspati:

"There is no heaven, no liberation, nor any soul in another world;

Nor do the acts of the Ashrams⁽¹⁾ or castes produce any reward.
The animal slain in the Jyotishtome (sacrifice) will go to heaven;

Why does not the sacrificer immolate his own father?

While life remains let a man live happily:

Let him feed on butter even if he runs into debt.

When once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return?"

He was the exponent of that materialism which said:

Preserve your wife, preserve your self,
But give them both to save yourself;
There's other wealth, another wife,
But where is there another life?

Brihaspati was the preceptor of the gods and his connection with this Epicurean philosophy is explained in the Upanishad as a ruse to destroy the demons whom he taught this false philosophy in order to compass their destruction,—an explanation which it applies equally to Buddh.(²)

But Charvak was not the only protagonist of materialism. For Schrader referring to a work called the Svasamved Upanishad says—"it is inspired by the Mahayanist-ya-vañ—doctrine of vacuity and proclaims a most radical agnosticism by asserting in four chapters (a) that there is no re-incarnation (existence being bubble-like), no God, no world; that all traditional literature (*Shruti* and *Smriti*) is the work of conceited fools; (b) that Time, the destroyer, and Nature, the originator, are the rulers of all existence and not good and bad deeds; and that there is neither hell nor heaven; (c) that people deluded by flowery speech cling to gods, sacred places, teachers, though in reality there is no difference at all between Vishnu and a dog; (d) that though all words are untrue and all ideas

(1) The four stages ■ life, viz., Student-ship, life of a householder, life of a forest-dweller and that of an ascetic.)

(2) *Minor. Up.* VII—8.

are illusions, yet liberation ■ possible by a thorough realization (*Bhavadvaite.*)”(1)

The tag at the end is wholly out of keeping with the rest of the sentiments and would seem to have been added more out of fear of the consequences than as a datum of conviction.

That arrant materialism and rank atheism were preached from the pulpit is, however, clear from references to them by Buddh himself, whose mind (though not his method) was wholly opposed to that cult.

The life of Buddh shows that if he had been born in any age or any other country, he would have been still a great Teacher, though his doctrine would have been different. The dominant note in his life was human service; compared to it, he regarded all else as secondary. The main and indeed the only purpose of his mission was to find a solution for the alleviation of human suffering. It is that which made him leave his purple bed, and it is that for which he was seeking a solution. The only solution he could find was that offered in the current thought of the day. He examined all possible solutions, and then by an eclectic process lighted upon a scheme neither Vedantic nor Sankhya, but one in which he substituted service for sacrifice and selflessness for Self. In doing so he affronted the heirophants of the true faith, whose tenets he denounced and whose institutions he ridiculed.

Buddhism owes its inception in India to the same causes and bears the same analogy to Hinduism as Christianity does to Judaism. Both were protests against the assumptions of the hierarchy. As Jesus inveighed against the supremacy of the Rabbis, Buddh inveighed against the supremacy of the Acharyas. As Christ heralded and gave his lead to the Reformation of Judaism, so equally did Gautam create a new movement against the ritualism of religion, its ceremonials, penances and sacrifices ordained to insure salvation. And as Christ repudiated the mediation of the Sheliach, so Buddhism repudiated the mediation of the Brahmanical priestcraft. Buddhism was thus the Protestantism of the East.

(1) (1908) Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Adyar Library, 300, 301.

But Buddhism was only a sojourner in its native land: it had shaken the roots of Hinduism, which it could not remove. But with great religious reformers it is always so. Jesus had preached his religion in Palestine, but Christianity could never expel Judaism. On the other hand, Judaism has expelled Christianity from Palestine. And so it has been with Buddhism. Both religions are exiles from their native land, though they have become world-religions. Verily, "Prophets are never honoured in their own country."

Buddh has been spoken of as a social reformer; but he was less a reformer than a humanitarian. He was not a religious teacher, even as religion was then understood. For he never cared to go beyond the depth of human reason. He was questioned as to his views on subjects such as God, the Soul, and the Eternal Life; but he declined to commit himself, contenting himself with the immediate object of his mission. But he could not have left blank places in his mind, and to the adepts he must have confided; he had, in fact, confided the resultant product of his ratiocination.

Unfortunately, we have no contemporaneous record of his teachings. But it is not surprising, since we have no contemporaneous record of the teaching of Christ who followed him six hundred years later; nor have we an authentic record of their lives.

In both cases, we have to glean such facts as we can, out of the conglomeration of tradition and romance, which in their colouring depict a type, rather than an individual. This is all the more regrettable, since the art of the historiographer is wholly unknown in India, and consequently, we have but a few contemporary references to the life of one who had by the sheer dint of his merit acquired a pre-eminence above that of many a king, and who on his death was accorded the obsequial rites of a universal monarch (*Chakravarti*).

The life of a man can never be dissociated from his work. This fact was recognized even by those devout disciples who have essayed to record his teaching by throwing it into the form of a biography of the teacher. But the ostensible

object of such works is to exalt the teacher and use his life as an aid to proselytism. But though such lives have necessary and serious drawbacks, still they are not wholly useless to the writer of a biography; since, experience has shown that many a legend is nothing more than a mass of exaggerated facts and many a romance contains, embedded beneath its obvious impossibilities, a sub-stratum of truth which would be lost, if there were a wholesale rejection of such materials. At any rate, the alternative is a life gleaned from such sources, or no life at all. Consequently, all writers on Buddhism have drawn upon these quarries for materials for their works. The present writer has done the same; but in doing so, he has followed a line of his own. He has collated and compared all the different versions and recorded only such as seemed to him to possess the back-ground of historical probability or circumstantial certainty. Even then, some incidents had to be recorded, which, though by no means answering to the test of historical casuistry, were nevertheless intended to possess a legendary or didactic value.

The materials available for his purpose are scanty. In the first place, we have the *Lalit Vistar*⁽¹⁾, an early work composed probably in the third century B.C. It depicts the life of Gautam from his abode in the *Fushit* heaven down to his Enlightenment, his visit to Benares and the conversion of his first five disciples there. This work was evidently composed under the ægis of the Mahayan school, as it refers to incidents which can have reference only to that school. One hundred and twenty scenes from this work were carved in mural frescoes on the stupa of Barabadur in Java about 750-850 A.D. The stone pictures were accompanied by explanatory sacred texts from the *Lalit Vistar* carved in the niches. An English translation of these inscriptions accompanies steel-plate engravings of the scenes in a work edited by Dr. N. J. Krom, Professor at Leyden University, from which the Legendary life in the ensuing pages is taken.

(1) *Lalit*—beautiful, *Vistar*—details; “Details of Beautiful life.”
particulars.

Another work of equal authority is the *Buddh Charit* of Ashvaghosh⁽¹⁾ written probably in the first century A.D. This work is in parts more detailed than the last, and it carries the story further, upto the return of Buddh to his home some eight years after his Buddh-hood. From this date upto within three months of his death, there is a gap and the events of his forty-seven years of missionary life can only be gleaned or guessed from the incidental references occurring in the later records of his discourses, or those in the Jain or Buddhist scriptures, supplemented, to some extent, by the Tibetan, Burmese or Sinhalese traditions. This is a most difficult void in his life, of which the biographical account can at best be sketchy. The scriptures teem with details, but their sequence can only be fixed by conjecture and by closely following the trail of the evolution of his teaching. Messrs. Spence Hardy and Bigandet have attempted to systematize these details upto the twentieth year of his Buddhhood; but their chronology is based on the Burmese and Sinhalese authors who do not disclose the sources of their own information, nor is it possible to say whether the details given by them depend upon the authority of the *Pitaks*, or only upon their commentaries. The details are a conglomeration of possible events and impossible fancy and have, therefore, been relegated to the chronological table with the necessary note of interrogation. The account of the closing three months of his life is given in a *Sutra* known as the *Mahaparinirvan* with its Pali variation which has been translated⁽²⁾. It was probably composed at about the latter end of the fourth or the beginning of the third century B.C.⁽³⁾ Similar or substantially the same account occurs in the *Mahavagga*⁽⁴⁾. We have, therefore, a vivid picture of the drop-scene. The Tibetan legends⁽⁵⁾ give additional details of the life; but they do not remove the hiatus which exists as to the sequence of events during the third period of his life.

The teachings of Buddh were oral, but they were memorized by persons who made recitation of the sacred

(1) Translated in 40 S. B. E.

(2) *Maha Parinibbana Sutta*, 11 S. B. E.

(3) *Ib. Intro.*, X; XI.

(4) *Tr. Childers*.

(5) *Dulva*.—See Glossary.

canon their speciality. Some centuries after his death they were collected and reduced to writing, probably after the meeting of the third council under Ashoke in 250 B.C. They are the *Tripitaks* (or three baskets, or collections) which form the canonical books of the Hinayan school and comprise (1) the *Vinay Pitak*—the book of discipline for the Order; (2) the *Sutta* (or *Sutra*) *Pitak*, the book of aphorisms, precepts and discourses for the laity, teaching them how to attain righteousness—Virtue and Benevolence (*Dhamm* or *Norm*) in which are included the *Jaataks* ⁽¹⁾ or a collection of stories of Buddha's previous births in the stories of old and folk-lore; and (3) *Abhidhamm* or supplementary philosophical dissertations. They are all written in Pali.

The Brahmanical scriptures were all composed in Sanskrit, with the result that the people had no access to them, except through the medium of their clerical expounders. Buddha conveyed his teachings in *populus vulgus* and exhorted his disciples to expound it to the people in their own vernaculars. In adopting this course, he could not have been unaware of the sacrifice of awe and veneration inspired by an unknown tongue, nor did he mind the diversity entailed by adopting the dialects as the medium of instruction. The fact is that two of his monks had actually complained to him to enshrine his tenet in Sanskrit, as they otherwise got distorted. But he reproved the suggestion, adding: "Monks, the word of Buddha is not to be turned into Sanskrit; let him who so turns it be guilty of an offence; I command you, monks, to learn the word of Buddha in its own dialect."⁽²⁾ The dialect in which Buddha imparted his teaching was Pali⁽³⁾, locally known as Magadhi, from the country in which it was spoken. It was probably little distinguishable from Prakrit⁽⁴⁾. Orientalists are, however, not agreed that Pali was anything more than a literary manufacture and it is said to have been distinct from Magadhi⁽⁵⁾; but this is not

(1) Sk. *Jaatak*, a Collection; from *Jaat*—born or brought into existence.

(2) Minayeff: *Pali Grammar* (Fr. Ed.) Preface XII; Childers' *Pali Dictionary*: Preface, II 1. n. (3).

(3) Pali in Sk. "mean line" "row" or "series."

(4) Childers. *Pali Dictionary* Preface, VII (f. n. I); XIII.

(5) Kern: "*Buddhism*."

Mr. Childers' view who relies on the high authority of Professor Max Muller for the view that both Pali and Sanskrit grew independently out of an older Aryan speech, that Pali is decidedly *later* than Sanskrit, and stands to it in the relation of a younger sister. It was certainly the vernacular in Ashoke's time, as is evidenced by his pillar inscriptions and edicts.

The development and expansion of Buddhism after the death of the Master is more or less a matter possessing historical fidelity. It is a well-known fact that the Master did not appoint any one to be his successor. His whole life culminating in his farewell address clearly shows that while Gautam had freely moved and consorted with all sorts and conditions of men, he had remained and he died a pronounced, but unpractical idealist. In fact, idealism is the key-note of his entire teaching. He believed that his flock, obedient to his word of command, would remain firm even when the shepherd's voice was stilled in the grave. He was mistaken. He had propagated his creed by the force of his boundless enthusiasm. His own commanding presence and resonant voice, his fervid earnestness and eloquence, memory of the throne he had vacated and the sceptre he had exchanged for a beggar's bowl,—could not but fail to arouse enthusiasm for a cause which he had espoused and a creed which, though opposed to the fundamental instincts of man, was nevertheless a creed which possessed to the low mind many attractions.

The fact is that like the person of Christ, Buddh's personality was all in all. And while he lived he had ruled his Sangh with iron discipline. Amongst his numerous disciples there were many capable men who had abandoned the snug retreats of their hermitages or the *pathshalas*⁽¹⁾ to join the band of devoted disciples of Buddh. They had all been enlisted as privates: they remained privates up to the end.

The growing tension which this enforced equality between men, when Nature had not made any two alike, came to a head the moment the Master's eyes were closed for the last

(1) Schools.

time. Subhadra, ⁽¹⁾ one of Buddha's disciples, flew into an outburst which threatened to rend the community; "Do not grieve, do not lament"—he is reported to have exclaimed, "It is well that we have been relieved of the Great Master's presence. We were oppressed by him, when he said 'This is permitted to you, this is not permitted.' In future we can do as we like, and not do as we do not like."

Subhadra was, of course, silenced by the faithful Kashyap who suggested the convention of a Council, to which reference will be found made in the ensuing text. But the hand of the council could not stay the hand of schism, which grew, as even the memory of the Master-mind began to fade; and as the religion grew and in time successfully invaded the citadel of orthodoxy, it became necessary to compromise with the opposing forces, leading to the relaxation of several points of the doctrine, and the re-introduction of some of the discarded tenets of Hinduism, together with some form of their idolatry and a colourable imitation of their ritualism. Idolatry with its faults is the most potent means of religious propaganda, in that it is an ocular demonstration of the dogmas of religion and by its picturesque and gorgeous ceremonials is an appealing instrument of conversion. Man accepts a new creed the more readily when his cold intellect is moved by the warmth of emotion, stirred by the sound of music,—the music of song, and the dazzling trappings of the visible gods and goddesses whose appearance upon the stage gives to the imagination a stimulus and to the mind a consolation, which the mere cold words of logic or of metaphysics can never hope to give.

It must have been, then, the pressure of necessity, not the foresight of expediency, that brought into existence the Mahayan School. This school had to be started in Northern India where Hinduism had its strong-hold. In the Southern Peninsula the

(1) Dr. Oldenberg in his Introduction to his edition of Mahavagga says that this man was the Subhadra whom Buddha had converted shortly before his death. (See Introduction XXVI). Rhys. Davids points out that this is a mistake since

the last convert was a Brahman, younger brother of his first convert Anna Kondam; while the complaining Subhadra had been a barber of Alama.—11 S. B. E. 127 f. n. (1).

Aryan invader had made no home; while Burmah and Ceylon were virgin-soils for the reception of the new faith, since the new faith had nothing tangible to displace.

Buddh had stated his doctrine with remarkable lucidity. Though it is now encrusted with ponderous additions, his own enunciation was both short and simple. When asked to give compendious expression to his views, he told them to follow his four sacred truths and the eight-fold path. The four sacred truths really stated the problem and the eightfold path suggested its solution ⁽¹⁾ in following the middle path between sacrifice on the one hand and sensuality on the other.

The first sacred truth was—that life was a suffering, the second pointed out the cause of suffering, the third, its cessation and the last, the path; i.e. the “Middle Path”—that is a path which, on the one hand, was free from devotion to the enervating pleasures of sense and, on the other, from any trust in the efficacy of penance and sacrifices. Thus, having eschewed the two extremes, sensuality and superstition, it counselled the eight modes of right living—being right in belief, aims, speech and action; livelihood, endeavour, mindfulness and meditation, ⁽²⁾ of which the first four were only obligatory on the laity, the last four being specially meant for the monks. This elaborate enumeration is neither logical nor exhaustive; but it is illustrative of right thought and action as alone constituting the “Middle Path,”—the measure of which is, of course, the Master’s voice. This creed may be condensed in a short call by the Master “O Ye sufferers, come: know why ye suffer; end your sufferings by right thought and action.” The reason why they suffer is given in the chain of causation which covers the entire field of Buddhist metaphysics, while the right thought and action, its entire field of ethics. The two together encircle the entire creed as Buddh taught and as it grew after his death. It focuses and places in the fore-front his entire life-work; for it is for the sake of sufferers and to relieve their sufferings that Buddh lived and died.

Such a religious formula, so simply expressed, amounts to no more than the enunciation of a principle of elementary mora-

(1) *Dhamma Satya Pavuchan Sutta*,
1—8; 11 S. B. E. 146-150.

■ *Dhamma Satya Pavuchan*
2—4; 11 S. B. E. 146, 147.

lity; and so Buddha conceived it. He had never intended that those who accepted his advice and followed him should throw up their allegiance to their own religion. But those who had to give up their faith in penance and sacrifice, which was the Vedic way of salvation, could not reconcile their new faith with their old; still, in receiving the new, they were not bound to renounce the old; for, did not the old orthodoxy count amongst its main pillars such heretical systems as the Sankhya and the Vaisheshik, not to mention the nihilism of Ajit and the materialism of Charvak?

Such was, then, the Buddhism as the Master had taught and as he had left on his death. But the gathering forces of re-action which were powerless to face him, began to raise their strident voice against the new fangled creed. But this creed had substituted reality for symbolism, sacrifice of self and selfishness for the sacrifice of bulls on the altar of God. It had consecrated human service above human mortification—death by abnegation above death by self-torture. It is this which gave Buddhism the preponderating advantage over Vedantism. It is this which vanquished Jainism at its very inception. But the idealism of Buddha was past human realization.

Self-interest is the law of life; it might be curbed, but cannot be wiped out. The two great impulses to human action are centred in that Self. Men began to ask themselves the question, —why should we make all these sacrifices? The answer was found in a compromise with the old doctrine. It had to be popularized and while the four councils met to re-cast the doctrine, they dispersed without grappling with the main theme of agitation. The malcontents formed themselves into a new sect, who while retaining the old doctrine, accommodated it to the irresistible circumstances which faced them. They multiplied the prizes to the devout, filled up the lacunæ in the old system, added a spectacular side to their religion and let the passers-by see their new religion in action. It was a religion preached within the cloistered walls of the academy: it was now understood in the market-place. This ■ all the difference between the Great way and the Little way. The followers of the latter remained the

adherents of the old school. The former became the Messiahs of new Buddhism. In the ensuing text the differences between the two sects have been set out. But those differences can be focussed within a narrow compass.

Buddh had preached his Gospel to the monks. His view was that salvation was not possible in the midst of worldly entanglements. He who sought Nirvan must, therefore, retire from the world. This was his theory, though he varied it in practice; His monks who entered upon Nirvan even in this life were called Arhats. They could not rise higher or acquire any other status, since Buddhism recognized no priesthood, and at the head of the religion stood Buddh himself as its founder, and his spiritual successor, Maitreya Bodhisatv, the Buddh-to-be, who was still reposing in the Tushit heaven.

The Mahayan threw open the benefits and prizes of their religion to all comers, including the laymen who were entitled to attain to Arhathood, if they obtained distinction in the practice of the creed; and they held that Buddhs and Bodhisatvs were unlimited in number and their status attainable by any one who cared to rise to their height in the practice of virtue and the acquisition of piety. All Buddh's elder disciples and other notables in the faith were at once canonized and entered in the calendar of Bodhisatvs, whose images were exhibited for veneration or worship.

The Mahayans then differed from the Hinayans in four important details. (1) They threw open the status of Bodhisatv for competition to a layman without making it an exclusive prize for the monks, as in the older doctrine; (2) they multiplied the Bodhisatvs and Buddhs, elevated men to that status, and in fact created a new world of Buddhist gods and established their paternal relations with men below; (3) they added *Bhakti* (devotion) to mere meditation as the means of attaining Nirvan; (4) they enlarged the theory of the non-existence of Ego by asserting the non-existence of the constituent elements or the non-existence of things. This was their doctrine of *Shoonya* or "the void." These doctrines were gradually evolved but they are all mentioned in the Chinese translations (148—170 A.D.),

which show that they must have been fixed a century or two earlier. The Mahayan school itself gave birth to two philosophical schools of the Madhyamikas and Vidnanvādins. The former was founded by Nagarjun (200 A.D.) who denies the existence of individuality or the individual, but taught the reality and permanence of Dharm (Dhamma) which comprises all thoughts and actions, every thought, every volition, every sensation, sound, colour, smell and touch. Just as a chariot ■ nothing but a collection of parts, so man is only a collection of these elementary realities, material and spiritual, which constitute his pseudo-individuality. Apart from Dhamm men and chariots have only an ideal existence—an existence of designation.

The Mahayans did not denounce their elder brethren,—the Hinayan—whom they held to be equally working for their Nirvan by the shorter route ; but they differed from them in the method for attaining it.

These two schools and their sub-sects, some doctrinal, others local, have created a vast and varied literature, the bulk of which exceeds anything written upon any other religion in the world. Mr. Spence Hardy thought that “ in size the Pitaks surpass all Western compositions ”⁽¹⁾. Rhys Davids, however, calculates that the Buddhist scriptures, including all the repetitions, and all those books which consist of extracts from the others, contain rather less than twice the number of words in the Bible and a translation of them into English would be about four times as long⁽²⁾. Rhys Davids, was however, only referring to the Indian Literature, but Buddhism in each country has created a literature of its own ;—that in China alone running into 2,213 books mentioned in the first collection (506—512 A.D.), of which, however, only 276 works are said to be extant. Some of these are merely translations of the Indian works, while others comprise commentaries and independent dissertations on the faith. Besides China, the other Buddhist countries, such as Japan, Tibet, Burmah and Ceylon have evolved a distinctive literature of their own ; but their canonical books are, of course, translations of the Indian scriptures, to which, as in the case of China, there have been added

(1) *Eastern Monachism*, 190.

(2) *Buddhism (Eng.)* 20, 21.

local commentaries, glosses and guide-books of the various sects into which Buddhism has become sub-divided everywhere.

The general trend of these works follows the line of thought developed in each school, of which there are said to be no less than eighteen of the Hinayan sect. But apart from their sectarian or local tinge, the bulk of the Buddhist literature marks three distinct stages in the evolution of Buddhist thought.

In the first place, we have his Nihilism of pure reason, which Buddha masked from his exoteric disciples by refusing to go beyond the immediate purpose of his teaching. "I have taught" he declared, "what is useful; what I have not stated, let that remain un-stated". The old *Pitaks* reflect his thoughts and do not venture into a speculation about the unknown. But the *Pitaks* might have silenced the pioneer-followers after his death, and not all of them. For we find numerous references in them to the heretics and heresies—"believers in the personality of the Self" ⁽¹⁾, in which they had the support of the Sankhya metaphysics. Then there were those who, though maintaining its existence, were content to hold that nothing could be predicated of it ⁽²⁾. They supported their doctrine by texts of their own. Then, as opposed to the positivists and the nihilists, there was a third train of thought which ran through some of Buddha's own teachings and which was purely agnostic. It was the doctrine of the Great unknown and unknowable,—upon which Buddha preferred to remain silent, and he justified his silence thus: "Why has not the Tathagat taught his disciples.....whether the Saint lives on beyond death or not?—Because the knowledge of these things does not conduce to progress in holiness. What contributes to peace and enlightenment Buddha has taught his own,—the truth of suffering..... Therefore, Malunkya-putra, whatsoever has not been revealed by me, let that remain unrevealed, and what has been revealed, let it be revealed" ⁽³⁾. His immediate purpose was to find the cure for human suffering; and his doctrine was, therefore, mainly ethical. That it was not solely ethical is due to the fact that while dealing with ethics he could not wholly ignore

(1) *Puṅgalu*—or "1 *Puṅgalu* cāḍḍins,"
Puṅgal, "Self" *Ṭāḍḍins* "Speakers."

(2) *Anabhikāṅga*.

(3) *Samyutta* *Nikaya*.

metaphysics. But that ■ was the only problem, which engaged his best thought, is clear from his own declaration: "As the vast ocean, O disciples! is impregnated with one taste, the taste of salt, so also my disciples, this law and doctrine is impregnated with but one taste, the taste of deliverance". (1)

Unlike the Vedānt or the Sankhya doctrines, which were complete by themselves and self-contained, Buddh had left his doctrine incomplete; and it was incomplete upon a most vital point in his teaching; namely,—what is Nirvan? As will be seen in the sequel, this term was at first defined merely as a negative conception. Its positive attributes were subsequently added; it let in the dual doctrines of *Ātman* and the *Absolute*; and then became indistinguishable from the Vedāntic dogma. In the main, neither the Vedāntic nor the Buddhist has much to learn from each other. The Vedāntic Absolute is Brahm, but it is impersonal and implies no more than cosmic energy. When, therefore, he speaks of the Soul's absorption in Brahm, and the Buddhist renders it as absorption in the "Void,"—what is the difference? And when again the Vedāntist speaks of the Self as dissipated into the elements and the Buddhist denies the existence as a noumenon, where is the difference? But the fact is that the unqualified Nihilisms of the Vedāntist and the Buddhist are the deductions of pure reason and neither was prepared to abide the consequence, the result being that expositors of both systems have striven to exhaust all the possibilities of speculation and conjecture; and these constitute the multitudinous systems which, though professedly based upon the main doctrines of the two systems, differ as much from them and from one another, as the pure deism of Hume differs from the pious nihilism of Abelard.

The development and expansion of Buddhism beyond the shores of India, the modifications of the doctrine willingly made, or forced upon it by the stress of local sentiment, out of recognition to the vested rights or of the age-long deities to which the priestcraft stood committed, belong to the history of Buddhism which cannot escape our attention and will be found set out in the sequel.

(1) *Kulavagga*, IX, 1, 4.

CHAPTER II.

INDIA BEFORE BUDDHISM.

India, north of the Ganges, is an extensive plain. In fact, if one travels from Lahore to Calcutta, one seldom sees a hill. It is in this fertile plain, watered by the Indus and the other rivers in the Punjab, the Ganges and the Jamna and their numerous tributaries in the area now known as the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, and in the Province of Bihar that the first hordes of the Aryan immigrants from the passes on the north and the north-west settled down. And it is here that the scene of early Buddhism was enacted. This vast plain, in Buddhist times, was sparsely populated: its population all told could not have exceeded twenty millions. There were only a dozen towns of any importance—the rest of the country was dotted with villages, in which the inhabitants followed their rustic occupation of farming and husbandry. The staple crops grown by them were wheat and rice, the latter in watery areas such as the Terai of the Himalayas where the annual rainfall is collected by these mighty barriers on the north and poured down into the plain below, inundating the fields and manuring them with their periodical wash-aways. The northern tracts of the United Provinces and Bihar are thus fertile valleys for the growth of rice, and Buddha's father and family were engaged in the raising of the crop. This part of the country was then covered with forest; only cultivation clearances had been made, and the villages and the fields were surrounded by the forests of primeval growth, which disappeared with the increasing pressure of population.

When Buddhism arose, there was no paramount sovereign in India⁽¹⁾. It was ruled by republics and monarchies of which four were of considerable size and importance. And foremost among them all was the Kingdom of Koushal (now Oudh) whose dominion covered the area now occupied by the United

(1) Rhys Davids—*Buddhist India*, p. 1.

Provinces. West and south of it, a number of small kingdoms maintained their independence. Eastward ■ had already extended its sovereignty over the Shakyas. To the south-east of Koushal lay another powerful kingdom of Magadh—now Bihar or the country to the east of Benares,—with its capital at Rajgrih, which in 300 B.C. vanquished Koushal. In Buddha's time the king of this country was Bimbeshwar (582-534 B.C.), who was succeeded by his son Ajat Shatru.

To the south, there was the kingdom of Vamshas or Vatsas, with its capital at Koushambi on the Jumna near Allahabad, south of which lay the kingdom of Avanti, with its capital at Ujjain, ruled over by King Pajjot. These and a dozen or more towns constituted all that could be classed as the urban life in India. The rest of the country was dotted with villages. All the ruling families were, of course, Kshatriyas united by marriage. The clans into which they were divided have since lost their identity in other names.

They numbered about thirty; of which the Shakyas⁽¹⁾ appear to have been as numerous (numbering a million) as they were powerful. Indeed, the clan name itself connotes power. The economic condition of the people then was little different from what one finds now in remote villages. From the remotest antiquity the villages in India have been autonomous in their internal management.

The village itself is now the subject of private ownership, but in the olden days this right was not recognized; for the function of the owner now was then performed by the headman who collected the rents, and generally acted as the *pater familias* to the villagers. All their internal affairs were regulated by custom and decided by the village Panchayat or Council of elders. Each village had its own tutelary village-god and its priest. The villages were inhabited by persons of all castes, who followed the occupations allotted to them by immemorial custom. The peasants cultivated their own fields, while those of a better class employed labourers, who became by custom

(1) Sk. *Shak*—to hold power.

attached to the soil. These were the serfs of the soil. There was no slavery.⁽¹⁾

But service akin to slavery was not unknown. The fact ■ that the fair-skinned Aryan immigrant, as he poured down into the country, found it sparsely populated by a dark-skinned aboriginal people whom he easily subdued and threw into the servile class.⁽²⁾ These aborigines belonged to the Mongolian stock and their squat "nose-less" faces aroused the contempt of the northern invader. Thus Vedic hymns abound in scornful references to them who are described as "gross feeders of flesh," "raw-eaters," "lawless," "disturbers of sacrifices" and "without gods." But they had all been subdued or driven into the forest long before the birth of Gautam.

Caste as such had not yet taken hold of the people who were divided into two main groups, Aryans and Aborigines; and at the head of both stood the Kshatriyas or the nobles and the warriors, who had conquered the country which they ruled. These claimed descent from the Sun and the Moon, were proud of their lineage, "fair in colour, fine in presence, and stately to behold".⁽³⁾ Below them stood the Brahman, claiming descent from the sacrificing priests. They were, equally with the Kshatriyas, distinguished by high birth and clear complexion. Below them came the Vaishyas, who formed the bulk of the Aryan people engaged in trade and husbandry. And last of all came the Shudras, men of aboriginal descent, dark-skinned labourers, serfs and persons who were employed to perform or who followed menial occupations, such as tilling the soil, handicraft or service. Indeed, all spheres of low trade—such as barbers, potters, weavers, mat-makers, leather-makers—appear to have been relegated to this class,—whether they were or were not of Aryan extraction. Even below them stood another class—the Chandals and Pukkusas—who were treated as social outcasts.

(1) Megasthenes: *Arrian Ind. Ch. X*, cited in Rhys. Davids' *Buddhist India*, 262.

For his opinion contra See *Ib.* 55.

(2) Sk. "Dasas"—slaves. ■ *Dialogues of Buddh* 1-148; Vin. II-4-160.

But caste, as we now understand it, had not then acquired the rigid immobility which ■ has since acquired. It was more or less vocational and flexible; and Manu himself classes the people into the twice-born and those falling under the head of commercial and servile classes. Inter-marriages between the twice-born appear to have been usual⁽¹⁾, though for the first marriage a Kshatriya must marry a Kshatriya and a Brahman a Brahman.⁽²⁾ But the laws of marriage were lax and love-matches known as *Gandharv* were recognized⁽³⁾; and one could marry a person seized as a prisoner in battles⁽⁴⁾, and a liaison had the same effect as a marriage.⁽⁵⁾ But even regular inter-caste marriages were usual, and the marriage of a Kshatriya prince with a potter, a basket-maker, a florist or a cook did not entail loss of caste.⁽⁶⁾ A Brahman, though belonging to a priestly class, was suffered to trade⁽⁷⁾ or live by hunting and trapping⁽⁸⁾ or as a carpenter.⁽⁹⁾ They are frequently mentioned as engaged in agriculture⁽¹⁰⁾ and as hiring themselves out as cowherds and even goat-herds.

The fact is—that the Brahman then had a lower social standing than a Kshatriya, in comparison with whom he was spoken of as “low-born”.⁽¹¹⁾ His claim to pre-eminence, even if made, was not then accepted. On the other hand, the Kshatriya from whom he had selected all his favoured gods, e.g., Ram and Krishna, showed their ascendancy in the social hierarchy. Brahmans and Kshatriyas inter-dined as they do so still. But it appears that the earlier stages of the struggle for priestly supremacy had just begun in the life-time of Gautam.

(1) *Manu*, III—4 (Sir Wm. Jones' Tr.), p. 40.

(2) *Ib.* III—12, p. 41.

(3) *Ib.* III—32, p. 43.

(4) *Ib.* III—33, p. 43.

(5) *Ib.* III—34, p. 43.

(6) *Jatak*, II—5.

(7) *Ib.* V—22.

(8) *Ib.* II—200, VI—170.

(9) *Ib.* IV—207.

(10) *Jat*, V—257; Rhys Davids' *Buddhist India*, 60.

(11) *Jatak* V—257; Rhys Davids' *Buddhist India* 6; The superiority of the Kshatriyas was undisputed in the *Vedas*. For we are read in the *Shatapath-Brahman*:

“Brahmans formerly one only. It energetically created an excellent form, the Kshatriya, viz., those amongst the Gods who are powers: viz., Indra, Varun, etc.; hence nothing is superior to the Kshatriyas therefore the Brahman sits below the Kshatriya at the *Rajasuya* sacrifice.” (Muir's *Old Sanskrit Texts* Vol. I p. 20). And in the same work elsewhere describing the graves of the dead ■ provides: “For a Kshatriya he may mark it as high as a man with up-stretched arms, for a Brahman reaching up ■ the mouth, for for a woman up to the hips, for a Vaisya up to the thighs, for a Shudra up to the knees.” (*Shatapath-Brahman* 44 S. B. E. 438, 439).

Literacy was not then general ; but writing had been invented, the alphabet being borrowed and adapted from the Semitic sources ; still, the writing of books had not yet commenced. All literature was committed to memory and the marvellous, indeed astounding, feats of memory were performed by those who made it their business to commit to memory a library of religious and philosophic literature. As an aid to memory this was consequently put in verse.

It is now agreed that the Sanskrit script was borrowed from the script of the Semitic tribes, who inhabited Babylon between which place and India there was a continued and extensive trade. This trade appears to have been carried on, both by land and sea,—by land, by way of the passes across Afghanistan, by sea, from ports on the west coast. The merchants were Dravidians who exported rice, ivory, apes and peacocks, frankincense and sandal-wood. The script appears to have been brought to India about the eighth or seventh century B. C. and the priests utilized it for drawing up memoranda on birch-bark, which was replaced by the leaves of the corypha and alipot palm, but never by clay-bricks as in Babylon. As writing was first utilized by the priestcraft, it soon became their monopoly till the Buddhists broke through it and widened its use by writing their canonical books equally upon metallic plates, stone-slabs and clay-moulds.

The Kharoshtri or Kashgar alphabet was introduced into India about 500 B.C. A Buddhist canonical book, written in that script with ink on birch-bark about the commencement of the Christian era, is still extant in the museums of Paris and Petrograd. But Ashoke's inscriptions on rocks and pillars, over 34 in number, are dated the third century B.C.

It is thus clear that knowledge in ancient India was disseminated by word of mouth. As there were professional memorists, who made it their duty to learn up and recite Sutras and books, so there were a large class of wandering hermits and peripetatic teachers of both sexes who made it their business to travel about eight months in the year with the sole

object of engaging in conversational discussions on matters of religion and ethics, philosophy, Nature-lore, and mysticism. Like the Sophists in Greece, they naturally differed greatly in intelligence, earnestness and honesty. Some are described as "hair-splitters" and "eel-wrigglers"⁽¹⁾, others were money-making charlatans; but, as a rule, they must have been earnest men; for they were everywhere welcomed and honoured, and special lecture-halls and rest-houses were built for their accommodation and convenience. They met their equals or their rivals there and discussions and debates were held and heard by the populace. They all belonged to or followed the doctrine of some recognized school of thought and carried their distinctive flags, as the distinguished amongst them travelled with a considerable retinue. For instance, there were the "Mundak Sevaks" or the disciples of the shaveling, "Gotamaka," the followers of Gautam, that is, of Dev Dutt, Buddh's cousin and opponent, who denounced Buddh as an easy-going hermit who did not practise asceticism, "Tridandika"—or the bearers of the triple staff—Brahmans who opposed the Buddhists—"Devadhaminika" or followers of the orthodox gods—the Sanatanists, as we should call them now.

As these and many more traversed the whole country, the question arises—which language did they adopt as the vehicle of their expression? It is obvious that there was then no *lingua franca* for India. There is no *lingua franca* to-day. Nor was the Sanskrit any substitute for such a language—classical Sanskrit was not then in existence and the Brahmanical Sanskrit was not understood by the people. But the Prakrit had then come into existence. The languages which the people spoke were probably Prakrit, supplemented and varied by the local vernaculars, which must have been more akin to the various local dialects still surviving. The wanderers must have been then, as indeed, their confreres are to-day, multi-linguists, and all their discussions must have been carried on in Prakrit or in the local dialect. The fact that Ashoke's inscriptions are inscribed in Pali does not, of course, show that Pali was the

(1) *Dialogues of Buddh*, I—37, 38.

spoken language, any more than the fact that the modern inscriptions in India are in English, shows that English is the language of the people.

Buddh had himself instructed his monks to preach to the people in their own dialect, which so far as the Koushal and Magadh countries were concerned, was probably Pali or Prakrit; also called Magadhi, from the country in which it was spoken ⁽¹⁾; and Buddhism would never have conquered India with such giant strides as it did within the short period of a hundred years, were it not for the fact that both its matter and manner of teaching went straight to the hearts of the people who readily threw up their allegiance to Brahmanism and embraced this faith, which became and remained a state-religion in India for a period of more than three hundred years.

The history of India before the seventh century B.C. is obscure and mainly unreliable. The two great kingdoms of Koushal and Magadh were, however, then well-established. Of these, the first appears to have been more important, and extended on the north to the Himalayas. Its capital was Shravasti on the Rapti, probably represented by Sahet-Mahet. It was about 300 B.C. conquered by and became absorbed in the neighbouring kingdom of Magadh (South Bihar), which was the theatre for the exploits of early Jain and Buddhist religions. Magadh was founded about 642 B.C., by Sisunag, or Sheshnag ⁽²⁾, a chieftain of Benares, who established his capital at Girivraj ⁽³⁾ or old Rajgrah ⁽⁴⁾ among the hills of the Gaya district.

The first monarch of whom any authentic account is available is the fifth king Bimbeshwar (called Bimbisar or Shrenik) who ruled for 28 years (582-554 B.C.) and extended his kingdom by the conquest of Anga (now Bhagalpur and Monghyr districts). He had married a daughter of the powerful Licchavi clan. He founded a new town of Rajgrih (now Rajgir), which Gautam visited after his renunciation and near which were his

(1) Childers' *Pali Dictionary*, *preface* XI f.n. (3) Minayeff: *Pali Grammar* (Fr. Ed.) *Preface* XLII.

(2) Sk. "King of serpents."
(3) Sk. "Royal mountain."
(4) Sk. "Royal Palace."

two favourite resorts,—the hill known by its shape as the "Vulture Peak" and the "Venu Ban" (the Bamboo-grove).

Both Bimbeshwar and Prasannajit, King of Koushal were the lay disciples and constant patrons of Gautam ⁽¹⁾. Bimbeshwar was succeeded in or about 554 B.C. by his son Ajit Shatru ⁽²⁾ (Aj at Shatru or Kunika) who reigned for 27 years. He followed in the footsteps of his father and patronized Buddhism but appears later to have come under the influence of Devdutt and embraced Jainism,—which aroused the ire of the Buddhists who accused him of parricide. He built a fortress at Patali on the river Sone which afterwards grew into the imperial capital of Pataliputra (or modern Patna). His mother, as already stated, belonged to the Licchavi clan and he himself married a princess of the Kushal (Koushal) clan.

The Kingdom of Koushal ⁽³⁾ was, in the middle of the seventh century, great and at the height of its power. The kingdom of the Shakyas owed allegiance to its king. The ruler Mahakushal, controlled a tract of country extending from the Himalayas to the Ganges and from the Kushal and Ramganga rivers on the west to the Gandak on the east. Its further ambition was checked by the powerful confederation of the Licchavis, who were, however, defeated by Ajit Shatru, son of Bimbeshwar, who equally subjugated and annexed the kingdom of Kushal (Koushal).

The Licchavi clan who played an important part in Indian history had their Republic in Brij (Rijjis) (now the Mozaffarpur district of Bihar). Their capital was Vaisali, near Basarh, twenty miles to the north of Hajipur on the right bank of the Ganges, about 27 miles distant in a direct line from Pataliputra (modern Patna). Their country enjoyed the republican form of Government, being ruled by a council of notables presided over by an elected President (Nayak). They were allied by marriage with the Kushals on the one hand, and the king of Magadh on the

(1) Vincent Smith's statement that King Bimbeshwar was a Jain appears to be erroneous.—*History of India*, p. 45.

(2) Sk. ("a"—not, "Jit"—conquered, "Shatru"—enemy) "invincible to his enemies." He is stated to have got tired of

his father's long reign and killed him. But the story is disbelieved, being a pure invention by the Buddhists.

(3) Sk. (*Kushal*—safe), "a king who ensures the safety of his subjects."

other. The wife of King Chandragupt I (322-298 B.C.), the founder of the Gupt dynasty, was a Licchhavi princess, and the clan is stated to have supplied a line of rulers in the Nepal valley upto the seventh century A.D.

The Licchhavis are said to have been related to the Shakyas. The Brahman writers regard them as degraded Kshatriyas; but modern historians opine that they were all Mongolian hillmen akin to the Tibetan and the modern Gurkha. The evidence upon which this opinion is based is the revolting practice, which they are said to have followed,—of exposing their dead which were sometimes hung upon trees, and their judicial procedure in criminal cases was exactly the same as that of the Tibetan. In the first place, these facts are founded upon tradition which cannot be any guide for drawing a historical inference. In the second place, it must be remembered that the Licchhavis have played an important role in the early history of India, and their very success may have led to the invention of a legend which the Brahmanical writers would certainly have improved upon, if it were true. But whatever may be the origin of the Licchhavis, the question is only one of historical interest. But the question whether Gautam Buddha was of Mongolian extraction—raises an issue which interests the entire Buddhist world. The evidence upon which this opinion is hazarded is again tradition, and even as such it is a *non sequitur*. It is said that the first Tibetan king was a Shakya belonging to another branch of the Gautam family, and that he was a Licchhavi and that the Shakyas were the Scythian or Turanian immigrants.⁽¹⁾ Now as to the first fact, if it be a fact, it does not support the conclusion; since a pure Kshatriya may have married into a Licchhavi family, but it does not make the family a Licchhavi. Then as to the Shakyas being of Scythian origin, it is a tradition which persists in the case of many Kshatriyas. That they were not aborigines is clear, but that they were Scythians or Turanians is merest conjecture, and in its origin it may have been worse—an invention.

In order to determine the ethnological origin of a race, tradition is never a safe guide unless it is supported

(1) V. Smith's *History of India*, pp. 48, 49.

by other facts. And what are the other facts here?—The Shakyas regarded themselves as a branch of the Kushal (Koushal) family and were latterly their tributaries. Now the Koushals are not classed as other than Kshatriyas of Aryan descent, and so must be their kinsmen, the Shakyas. Only recently it has been ascertained that the dialects of Rajasthan bear a close resemblance to those spoken along the Himalayas, not only in Nepal but as far west as Chumbi. Rhys Davids thinks that this only shows that the ancestors of the two must have been living close together when they began their wanderings to the east and the south respectively. "Both started from the Northern Punjab, and probably neither migration followed the Gangetic valley" (1). Then again, the fact that the Licchhavis exposed their dead,—is again a *non sequitur*, since it is not shewn to be an exclusively Mongolian custom. The ancient Persians did the same, as do the modern Parsis; but no one has yet suggested that they were Mongols. Indeed, if this were the crucial test, it disproves the very theory it is sought to prove, since the body of Buddha was never exposed, but cremated,—a purely Aryan method of disposal. Thirdly, Buddhism being the religion of the Mongolian race, it is natural to claim the Liberator as their own. But if this were a fact, the Brahmans, who had invented caste and were anxious to preserve its purity, would not have been the last to denounce the founder of the new creed, which had crushed their religion, as a foreigner and a Mongol for whom the Vedic sages had supreme contempt. The fact that they treated him as a Kshatriya would be conclusive, added to which we have the contemporaneous account of his features which could only be those of a pure Aryan.

As already mentioned, the term "Kshatriya" had in those days no greater significance than the term Brahman. Both were more descriptive of the clan, rather than of the caste, which had not then become crystallized into the rigid system it has since become. Such is, at any rate, the view of those whose authority is equally unquestionable. (2)

(1) (1901) *J. R. A. S.* 808; cited in Rhys Davids' *Buddhist India*, pp. 32, 33. (2) M. Williams—*Buddhism* p. 21. Oldenberg—*Buddhism*, pp. 97, 98.

CHAPTER III.

FAITHS AND PHILOSOPHY IN BUDDH'S TIME.

It is impossible to understand the nature and extent of Buddh's contribution to the world's *faiths* and thought, without understanding the nature of the *Faiths and Fallacies* which confronted Buddh when he evolved his doctrine. As Gautam was a Hindu, and as such brought up in the shadow of that system, it is necessary to first examine the position of the Hindu in the seventh century before Christ.

The intensive study of Greek has naturally familiarized European scholars with the trend of Hellenic thought; but it is only during recent years that European scholars have found time to turn their attention to the language and literature of farther East. The reason for this neglect is not far to seek. With the advent of Christianity and its establishment in Europe, Europeans became naturally anxious to learn all about their religion; and as their Bible itself was written in Greek, they were attracted to the language and literature of that distinguished country. Its language had enriched the European languages, while its literature, at once varied and vast, gave to the scholar a double incentive of improving his language and enriching his mind. On the other hand, the literature of India was found embedded in a foreign tongue—a tongue the identity of which as a parent of the Aryan stock has only been established in comparatively recent times. And even then, its connection was remote and of no immediate practical value. Its literature was all embedded in that tongue, which was as difficult to master as it was difficult to understand. It was not, moreover, and it had been in all probability never,—a spoken tongue. The study of that language had, therefore, not the same practical value as the study of Latin or Greek. The literature to which it gave expression was the literature of an alien people, whom the Christians designated heathen, and to whom they ascribed opinions and views even more ridiculous than those held by the African savage or the Australian bushman.

The vast treasure-house of Oriental learning is, however, gradually being unearthed now; its principal books translated into European languages and a sober study made of its religious faiths. But, since Oriental scholars possess a religion of their own, they have not been always fair to the religions of other people; nor have they appreciated the eternal truths to which some of them have given expression.

Unfortunately, of all such religions, Buddhism has been the greatest sufferer in this respect: for it is a religion, which impartial research has now proved to have been the parent of Christianity: not only as regards its main tenets, but also in the life and history of its founder and the organization of his Church.

And even where the two differ, as they do upon points incidental to their history, Buddhism possesses an advantage: because its founder had placed before its history the torch-light of reason.

How far his reason has advanced the cause of Philosophy and how this ancient faith is able to withstand the shock of modern thought—is a question upon which we have to dwell at length in the sequel. For the present it would be sufficient if we examined the ground upon which the seed of Buddhism was sown.

It is now admitted that the Vedas are amongst the oldest of religious books in the world. European scholars are practically agreed that they must have existed in their present form from at least 1,200 to 1,000 B.C. (1) "Scholars also agree that they contain a good deal of material even much older, and that the hymns in this last respect stand on the same footing as the Buddhist Pitakas or the Old Testament, or any other ancient Canon" (2). So Max Muller wrote that "the first germs of Upanishad doctrines go back at least as far as the Mantra period, which provisionally has been fixed between 1,000 and 800 B.C." (3) and which he describes as "among the most astounding productions of the human mind in any age and in any country" (4)

(1) Rhys Davids *Buddhism* (Am. Ed.) p. 15.

(2) *Upanishad I S.B.E. Introduction* LXVI.

(3) *Ib.* pp. 15, 16.

(4) *Ib.* p. LXVII.

and of which Schopenhauer wrote: "In the whole world there ■ no study, except that of the originals, so beneficial and so elevating as that of the Upanishads. It has been the solace of my life, it will be the solace of my death." (1)

The Upanishads which number close on 200 embody the Hindu system of Philosophy and Religion. For in those early days the difference between the two was neither well-marked, nor indeed even dimly appreciated; they were both treated as a part of the subject comprised in the term "Dharm," (2) a large term which included duty of any kind—political, religious, ethical and social; it even included ceremonial observances and Law. Their views on religion were professedly rational. For had not the Upanishads said?—"Now that light which shines above this Heaven, higher than all, higher than everything, in the highest world, that is the same light which is within man." (3)

Starting with this, it postulates the existence of God (4) and Soul (5). "The Infinite indeed, is below, above, behind, before, right and left,—it is indeed, all this." Now follows the explanation of the Infinite as the "I": "I am below, I am above, I am behind, before, right and left—I am all this." Next follows the explanation of the Infinite as the Self: "Self is below, above, behind, before, right and left: Self is all this." (6) "To him who sees, perceives, and understands this, the spirit (*Pran*) springs from the Self, hope springs from the Self, memory springs from the Self, so do ether, fire, water, appearance, and disappearance, food, power, understanding, reflection, consideration, will, mind, speech, names, sacred hymns and sacrifices—aye, all this springs from the Self." (7) "The Self which is free from sin, the Self which ■ free from death and free from old age, from death and grief, from hunger and thirst, which desires nothing but what it ought to desire, and imagines nothing but what it ought to imagine, that it is which we must search out, that it is which we must

(1) *Upanishads* I S. B. E. Introduction p. LXI.

(2) *Sk.* "Dharm," lit. "Duty."

(3) *Upanishads* III-13-8; I S. B. E. p. 47.

(4) *Ib.* I-9-4; I S. B. E. p. 17.

(5) *Upanishads* III-15-5; I S. B. E. p. 48.

(6) *Ib.* VII-25-1, 2; I S. B. E. pp. 123, 124.

(7) *Ib.* p. 124.

try to understand. He who has searched out that Self and understands it, obtains **all** worlds and all desires"(1). "All this, whatsoever moves on earth, is to be hidden in the Self. When thou hast surrendered all this, then thou mayst enjoy. Do not covet the wealth of any man. Though a man may wish to live a hundred years performing works, it will be thus with him; but not in any other way: work will thus not cling to a man. There are the worlds of the Asuras covered with blind darkness. Those who have destroyed their Self (who perform works, without having arrived at a knowledge of the true Self) go after death to those worlds. That One (Self), though never stirring is swifter than thought. The Devas (senses) never reached it,—it walked before them.—Though standing still, it overtakes the others who are running. Matarishvan (the wind, the moving spirit) bestows powers on it. It stirs and it stirs not; it is far, and likewise near. It is inside of all this, and it is outside of all this. And he who beholds all beings in the Self and the Self in all beings, he never turns away from it. When to a man who understands, the Self has become all things, what sorrow, what trouble can there be to him who once beheld that unity?"(2)

It will be seen that the starting main motif of the Upanishad philosophy was to establish the unity of the lower Self, which we may call for convenience—the Ego, with the universal Self,—which is another name for God. The merging of one into the other was its ruling principle.

The Upanishads (3) are a part of the Vedas, being a part of the Aranyakas, which began to be treated as the quintessence of the Vedas and are, therefore, included in the term *Shruti*(4) "or direct revelation from God." They profess to be the work of no human hand. The Upanishads number about 200 and promulgate diametrically opposing doctrines. This is due to the fact that whenever a new school of thought came into exis-

(1) I. S. B. E. p. 134.

(2) I. S. B. E. pp. 311, 312.

(3) *Sk. Upa-near and Sad—to sit; lit. Sitting near (some one) to listen or for worship: Max Muller Sk. Lit. (All.*

Reprint) pp. 163, 164.

(4) *Sk. Shrus "Heard" (from God) as opposed to Smrit "remembered" (i.e. tradition).*

tence, it composed an Upanishad of its own and tacked it on to the older Upanishads. One of the Upanishads declares that knowledge of God cannot be obtained without a Messiah: "That Divine Self is not to be grasped by tradition, nor by understanding, nor by all revelation; but by him whom He Himself chooses, by him alone, is He to be grasped; that Self chooses body as His own."⁽¹⁾ In another Upanishad⁽²⁾ God is reduced to a mere phantom: "Is Brahman the cause? Whence are all born? By what do we live? Where do we go? At whose command do we walk after the law, in happiness and misery? Is Time the cause, or Nature, or Law, or chance, or the elements? Is man to be chosen as the source of all? Nor is it their union, because there must be independent Self, and even that independent Self has no power over that which causes happiness and pain." The Upanishads return no clear or consistent answer to what is God. Some speak of Him as a masculine Self—implying that He is personal⁽³⁾, while others speak of Him in the neuter gender, implying that it is merely a Power. ⁽⁴⁾ In some books he is spoken of merely as *Sat* or a Being ⁽⁵⁾, while in others he is called *Asat* which is the negation of *Sat*.

Then as regards creation, the Upanishads support every view, theistic, atheistic, agnostic, nihilistic, and pantheistic, and the combination of some or all of them and many more, for which no compendious expression exists at present. The fact that this would lead to hopeless contradictions and irreconcilable differences does not seem to have perturbed the ancient thinkers, who ascribed their differences to localities, rather than to the rival schools of thought, of which there were no less than 1,180; and as each school ⁽⁶⁾ claimed to have an Upanishad of its own, there must have been as many Upanishads as there were schools. That they could not have all come into existence *per saltum* is, of course, obvious. But this much seems clear that the Vedant Philosophy, by which all the schools were collectively known, marked an epoch in the progress of human thought in which the

(1) *Katha Upanishad*, 11—23: *Sec 1 S.B.E.*

(2) *Shvetashvatara—Upanishad*; *Sk. shves*—white, *ashva*—horse, and *śru*—to cross: "crossing by means of a white horse."

(3) *Bahvrichas.*

(4) *Pañchiriyas.*

(5) *Chhandogya.*

(6) Called *Shakha*, *Sk.* "a branch," "an off-shoot."

liberty of human conscience had the widest field for display. In this respect the Hindu religion was at one time the most catholic in the world and presented a striking contrast with the other religious systems of the world.

That religion began with the Vedic ritual, in which the obtaining of earthly happiness, and afterwards bliss in the abode of Yama was obtainable only by the offer of correct sacrifices to the Gods. The second stage was reached, almost simultaneously or soon afterwards, when release from mundane existence by the absorption of the individual soul in the world-soul, through correct knowledge (not conduct yet), became the objective. Here, therefore, the sacrificial ceremonial became useless, and speculative knowledge all-important. ⁽¹⁾ The Rig-ved, the oldest of the four Vedas, recognized a personal God, Prajapati,⁽²⁾ and Purush ⁽³⁾—Man, rather the world-man. This concept developed in the Upanishads into *Atman* or "Soul," or *Brahm* or Spirit of the universe which pervaded the universe. The words "*Brahm*" and "*Atman*" are found in the Vedas, but *Brahm* is there used to denote nothing more than "Prayer" or "Dev," while *Atman* in the Rig-ved means no more than "Breath," wind for instance, is spoken of as the *Atman* of *Varun*. The Upanishads gave it a wider, indeed, a newer meaning: "The *Atman*," it says, "is here all-pervading down to the tips of the nails. One does not see it any more than the razor hidden in its case or fire in its receptacle. For it does not appear as a whole. When it breathes, it is called breath, when it speaks, voice, when it hears, ear, when it thinks, mind. These are merely the means of its activities. He who worships the one or the other of them has not correct knowledge.....one should worship it as the Self. For in it all these—breath etc. become one." ⁽⁴⁾

In the old Upanishads the doctrine is first stated that the material world is an illusion, a *maya*—produced by *Brahm* as a conjuror (*mayin*). This is repeated in the later Upanishads, in which the whole doctrine of the Upanishads is

(1) Macdonnell's *Sanskrit literature*, —Lord or Creator; Lit. "Lord of creation." p. 218. (2) *Sk. Purush*—man.

(3) *Sk. Praja*—subjects, or created, *Pati* (4) *Brihadaranyak* I—IV.

summed up in the famous formula—"That art thou," ⁽¹⁾ which is explained to mean that the world-soul (*Atman*) and the individual soul are identical: "This whole world consists of it, that is the Real, that is the Soul, that art thou, Shwaitketu" ⁽²⁾, "Even as the smallest granule of millet, so is this golden Purush in the heart.....That Self of the spirit is my Self ; on passing from hence, I shall obtain that self." ⁽³⁾ This is made clear by Yadnyavalkya to his wife Maitreyi, as he was about to renounce the world and retire to the forest: "As a lump of salt thrown into the water would dissolve and could not be taken out again, while the water, wherever tasted, would be salt, so is this great being, endless, unlimited, simply composed of cognition. Arising out of these elements, it disappears again in them. After death, there is no consciousness." ⁽⁴⁾ In another passage of the same Upanishad, we find the following: "Just as the spider goes out of itself by means of its thread, as tiny sparks leap out of the fire, so from the Atman issue all vital airs, all worlds, all gods, all beings." ⁽⁵⁾

In other words, the prevailing doctrine of the Upanishads is Pantheistic. Life is an emanation from Brahm into which it returns. As clouds arise from the sea and fall into rivers, and rivers flow into the sea and are lost, so is Atman; it comes out of the Divine Atman and merges into it in the end.

Out of this monistic doctrine of the Divine Soul, permeating the universe, of which the human soul and the creation is but an emanation, there arose the doctrine of the transmigration of the soul, and with it the doctrine of Karm; both of which find places in the oldest Upanishads which Buddha adopted as his own.

All the Upanishads allude to or describe these two doctrines; but the theory of transmigration is given in greatest detail in the Chhandogya Upanishad, where it is thus described: "This germ, covered in the womb, having dwelt there ten months, or more or less, is born. When born, he lives what-

(1) Sk. "tat tvam asi". (तत् त्वम् असि)

(2) Chhandogya Upanishad, VI—8-16.

(3) Shatapath Brahman, X—VI-3.

(4) Brihadaranyak Upanishad II—IV.

(5) *Ib.* II—1-20; To the same effect Mandukya III—11-8; Chhandogya VIII—7-12; Brihadaranyak III—VII.

ever the length of his life may be ; when he has departed, his friends carry him as appointed to the fire (of the funeral pyre) from whence he came, from whence he sprang. Those who know this, even though they still be Grihasths⁽¹⁾, and those in the forest who follow faith and austerities, and of the Pari-Vrajaks, those who do not yet know the highest Brahman, go to light, from light to day, from day to the light-half of the moon from the light-half of the moon to the six months when the sun goes to the north, from the six months when the sun goes to the north to the year, from the year to the sun, from the sun to the moon, from the moon to the lightning. There is a person not human who does not go to the Brahman. That is Soma the king. But they, who living in a village practise a life of sacrifices, works of public utility, and alms, they go to the smoke, from smoke to night, from night to the dark-half of the moon, from the dark-half of the moon to the six months when the sun goes to the south. But they do not reach the year. From the months they go to the world of the fathers, from the world of the fathers to the earth, from the earth to the moon. Here they are loved by the Devas, yes, the Devas love them. Having dwelt there till their good works are consumed, they return again that way as they came, to the ether, from the ether to the air. Then the sacrificer, having become air, becomes smoke, having become smoke, he becomes mist. Having become mist, he becomes a cloud, having become cloud, he rains down. Then he is born as rice and corn, herbs and trees, Sesame and Beans. From thence the escape is beset with most difficulties. For whoever the person may be that eats the food, and begets off-spring, he henceforth becomes like unto them. Those, whose conduct has been good, will attain some good birth, the birth of a Brahman, or a Kshatriya, or a Vaishya. But those, whose conduct has been evil, will quickly attain an evil birth, the birth of a dog, or a frog, or a Chandala⁽²⁾ ; on neither of these two ways those small

(1) Sk. "Householders," as opposed to
"Vanaprasths"—forest-dwellers, ascetics.

(2) Lowest class of Shudra.

creatures (flies, worms, etc.) are continually returning, of whom it may be said, 'live and die.' There is a third place."⁽¹⁾

The Vedānt doctrine expounded dualism, but it developed in the leading Upanishads into pure Monism with the super-added doctrines of metempsychosis and Karm. The Upanishads likened human experience to a dream in which the visions appear real, but disappear as soon as the dreamer wakes. The reality of the world depends upon human consciousness. As soon as it disappears, what remains? This doctrine was at one time upheld by Shankar⁽²⁾; though later on he repudiated it and reverted to the realism of the Vedas. He said: "The perception is to be considered as similar to a dream and the like. The ideas present to our minds during a dream, magical illusion, a mirage and so on, appear in the two-fold form of subject and object, although there is all the while no external object; hence, we conclude that the ideas of posts and the like which occur in our waking state are likewise independent of external objects; for they are also simply ideas. If we be asked how, in the absence of external things, we account for the actual variety of ideas, we reply that the variety is to be explained from the impression left by previous ideas."

To all this we (the Vedāntists) make the following reply: "The non-existence of external things cannot be maintained, because we are conscious of external things. In every act of perception, we are conscious of some external thing corresponding to the idea, whether it be a post or a wall or a piece of cloth or a jar, and that of which we are conscious cannot but exist. Why should we pay attention to the words of a man who, while conscious of an outward thing through its approximation to his senses, affirms that he is conscious of no outward thing, and that no such thing exists, any more than we listen to a man who, while he is eating and experiencing the feeling of satisfaction, avers that he does not eat and does

(1) *Chhandogya Upanishad* 1-V—9-1 et
q. 1 S.B.E. pp. 79-82.

(2) Also called Shankar Acharya
(Shankar, the preceptor); flourished 800

not feel satisfied? If the Buddha should reply that he does not affirm that he is conscious of no object, but only that he is conscious of no object apart from the act of consciousness, we answer that he may indeed make any arbitrary statement he likes, but that he has no arguments to prove what he says.

“That the outward thing exists apart from consciousness—has necessarily to be accepted on the ground of the nature of consciousness itself. Nobody when perceiving a post or a wall is conscious of his perception only, but all men are conscious of posts and walls and the like as objects of their perceptions. That such is the consciousness of all men, appears also from the fact that even those who contest the existence of external things bear witness to their existence, when they say that what is an external object of cognition appears like something external. For they practically accept the general consciousness which testifies to the existence of an external world, and being at the same time anxious to refute it, they speak of the external things as ‘like something external.’ If they did not themselves at the bottom, acknowledge the existence of the external world, how could they use the expression, ‘like something external?’ No one says, ‘Vishnumitra appears like the son of a barren woman.’ If we accept the truth, as it is given to us in our consciousness, we must admit that the object of perception appears to us as something external, not like something external.

“But, the Buddha may reply, ‘we conclude that the object of perception is only like something external, because external things are impossible.’

“This conclusion, we rejoin, is improper, since the possibility or impossibility of things is to be determined only on the ground of the operation or non-operation of the means of right knowledge; while, on the other hand, the operation and non-operation of the means of right knowledge are not to be made dependent on pre-conceived possibilities or impossibilities. Possible is whatever is apprehended by perception

or some other means of proof ; impossible is what is not so apprehended. Nor, again, does the non-existence of objects follow from the fact of the ideas having the same form as the objects ; for, if there were no objects, the ideas could not have the form of the objects, and the objects are actually apprehended as external. For the same reason (*i.e.*, because the distinction of things and ideas is given in consciousness), the invariable concomitance of idea and thing has to be considered as proving only that the thing constitutes the means of the idea; not that the two are identical.

“ Moreover, when we are conscious first of a pot and then of a piece of cloth, consciousness remains the same in the two acts, while what varies is the distinctive attributes of consciousness ; just as, when we see at first a black cow and then a white cow, the distinction of the two perceptions is due to the varying blackness and whiteness, while the generic character of the cow remains the same. The difference of the one permanent factor (from the two or more varying factors) is proved throughout by the two varying factors, and *vice versa*. Therefore, thing and idea are distinct.

“ Further, if you say that we are conscious of the idea, you must admit that we are also conscious of the external thing.

“ And if you rejoin that we are conscious of the idea on its own account because it is of a luminous nature like a lamp, while the external things are not so, we reply that by maintaining that the idea is illuminated by itself, you make yourself guilty of an absurdity, no less than if you said that fire burns itself. And at the same time you refuse to accept the common and altogether rational opinion that we are conscious of the external things by means of the idea different from the things ! Indeed, a proof of extra-ordinary philosophic insight ! ”

The monistic doctrine of the Upanishads was combated by Kapil, the rationalistic founder of the Sankhya⁽¹⁾ philosophy,

(1) The doctrine is expounded in Book XII *Shanti Parva* 20-49 *Dutt's* Tr. pp. 432-434.

to which references are to be found only in the later Upanishads. Kapil preceded Buddha who followed and elaborated his doctrine. Kapil is so mentioned by the Buddhist writers and frequent references to him occur in the Mahabharat, the twelfth book of which may be regarded as the text-book of the system, since it has no Upanishad of its own, nor has it left traces of any writing to which Kapil may have committed his system. Indeed, the very existence of such a person as Kapil is doubted, in spite of the unanimity with which Indian tradition designates a man of this name, as the author of certain Sutras. The oldest manual of the system, though attributed to Kapil is, of course, a comparatively modern compilation being composed only about 1,400 A.D. The oldest systematic treatise extant is the Sankhya-Karika of Ishwar Krishna, translated into Chinese between 557 and 583 A.D. It mentions Panchashikh as the chief exponent of the system, who may have lived about the beginning of the Christian era.

Kapil's philosophy, as described in the Mahabharat, is relentlessly iconoclastic and essentially rational. Referring to the miseries of life upon which the Vedantists dwell, he chaffed them with the self-inflicted miseries of penance and sacrifice. He maintains: "Direct evidence is the basis of both inference and the scriptures. The scriptures can be contradicted by direct evidence. As to inference, its value is not much. Do not reason on inference only, whatever may be the subject. There is nothing else called individual soul other than the body. The capacity to produce the banyan seed possesses the capacity to produce leaves, flowers, fruits, roots and bark....Likewise from the vital seed is produced the body, with its attributes, the understanding, consciousness, mind and other qualities. Two pieces of wood rubbed together beget fire. Likewise the material body produces the mind and its attributes of perception, memory, imagination, etc. As the loadstone moves iron, likewise the senses are controlled by the mind. Some hold that their re-birth is caused by ignorance, the desire for acts, cupidity, carelessness, and bent towards other vices. They say that ignorance is the soil,

acts form the seed that is placed in that soil. Desire is the water that causes that seed to grow.

In this manner they explain re-birth. They hold ignorance being ingrained in an imperceptible way; one mortal body being destroyed, another originates at once from it; and that when it is consumed by the help of knowledge, the destruction of existence follows, or the person attains to what is called liberation. This opinion is also mistaken. It may be asked that when the being that is thus re-born is a different one, in its nature, birth and objects of virtue and vice, why should it then be considered to be identical with the being that was? Indeed, the only inference that can be made is that the entire chain of existence of a particular being is not really one of connected link. Then again, if the being that is the outcome of re-birth, is really different from what it was in a pristine existence, it may be asked what satisfaction does the person gain from the exercise of the spirit of charity, or from the acquisition of knowledge or of ascetic power?—since the acts performed by one are to bear fruits upon another person in another state of existence. And the refutation of the doctrine would be—that one in this life may be rendered miserable by the acts of another in a pristine life, or having become miserable may again become happy. By witnessing, however, what actually takes place in the world, a proper conclusion may be drawn regarding the unseen.”⁽¹⁾

“The separate consciousness that is the outcome of re-birth, is different from the consciousness that had preceded ■ in a pristine existence. The way, however, in which the appearance of that separate consciousness is explained by that theory is not at all consistent or reasonable. The consciousness was the very opposite of eternal, being only transitory, extending as it did, till the dissolution of the body. That which had an end cannot be considered as the cause for the production of a second consciousness appearing after the end. ■ again, the very loss of the previous consciousness be considered as the cause of the production of the second

(1) *Mahabharat*, Dutt's Tr. pp. 322, 323.

consciousness, then when the death of a human body is caused by a heavy bludgeon, a second body would originate from the body that is thus deprived of animation.

"Again, their doctrine of annihilation is subject to the objection that extinction will become a revolving phenomenon like that of the seasons, or the year, or the yuga, or heat, or cold, or agreeable or disagreeable objects.

"If, for avoiding these objections, the followers of this doctrine hold the existence of a Soul that is permanent and with which each new consciousness is attached, they again subject themselves to the new objection that that permanent substance, by being overcome with decrepitude and with death that causes destruction, may in time be itself weakened and destroyed. If the supports of a palace are weakened by time, the mansion itself is sure to fall down in the end.

"The senses, the mind, wind, blood, flesh, bones, one after another meet with destruction and enter each time its own productive cause.

"If again the existence of an eternal Soul is held—which is immutable, which is the refuge of the understanding, consciousness, and other similar attributes, and which is dissociated from all these,—such an assertion is subject to a serious objection; for then all that is usually done in the world would be meaningless, especially with reference to the attainment of the fruits of charity and other religious acts. All the injunctions in the Shrutis regarding those acts, and all acts connected with the conduct of men in the world, would be equally meaningless; for the Soul being dissociated from the understanding and the mind, there is no one to enjoy the fruits of good acts and Vedic rites⁽¹⁾."

Kapil denies the existence of a supreme God as creator or ruler of the universe. He denied that there was any cogent evidence about the existence of God; still less was there any evidence that He had created and ruled the universe. He pointed to the origin of misery and pain, cruelty and injustice,

(1) *Mahabharat: Shanti Parv Bk. XII—§27.*

suffering and pain, decay and death which were unjustly apportioned and unequally suffered,—which a just and benevolent God could not tolerate, and for which, ■ He existed, He could not escape the reproach of cruelty and partiality. His existence must then be ruled out as beyond the pale of reason—what then remains? How is the existence of the universe to be accounted for? His theory of cosmogony strictly follows the line of inductive ratiocination. His argument proceeds from the known to the unknown till the ultimate cause is reached, beyond which he refuses to go, and those who do, he attacks by the same weapon of reason by which he has built up his system. To him the world is real, because it is proved by apperception. That world is eternal and has been and ■ developing, according to certain laws, out of primordial matter⁽¹⁾. It has had no beginning and it will have no end—though it will dissolve into primitive matter, alternating with evolution, existence and dissolution.

But what becomes of the Soul, while matter is undergoing its pre-destined course through these three stages?

Kapil maintains that the Soul or *Purush* remains only a passive spectator. It is the Supreme Spirit into which all individual consciousness merges, just as the rivers flow into and are lost in the sea. But just as the drops that make the river never lose their identity, even though they become merged in the sea, so the individual soul, if it may be so called, does not lose its identity, though it is blended with the cosmic soul.

“The psychology of the Sankhya system is specially important. Peculiarly interesting ■ its doctrine—that all mental operations, such as perception, thinking, willing, are not performed by the soul, but are merely mechanical processes of the internal organs, that is to say, of matter. The soul itself possesses no attributes or qualities, and can only be described negatively. There being no qualitative difference between souls, the principle of personality and identity is supplied by the subtle or internal body, which, chiefly formed of the inner

(1) *Sk.* “*Prakṛiti* or “*Pradhān*,”—primitive matter.

organs and the senses, surrounds and is made conscious by the soul. This internal body, being the vehicle of merit and demerit, which are the basis of transmigration, accompanies the soul on its wanderings from one gross body to another, whether the latter be that of a god, a man, an animal, or a tree. Conscious life is bondage to pain, in which pleasure is included by the peculiarly pessimistic system. When salvation, which is the absolute cessation of pain, is obtained, the internal body is dissolved into its material elements, and the soul, becoming finally isolated, continues to exist individually, but in absolute unconsciousness."⁽¹⁾

Kapil explains it by postulating the existence of matter and soul. According to him, matter is unconscious but contains within itself the power of evolution (in the interests of souls, which are entirely passive during the process) while Karm alone determines the course of that evolution.

The rigours of this logical system appear, however, to have been relaxed by a method adopted for bridging the gulf between the seen and the unseen. For both the Sankhya and the Vedant appear to have agreed on the practice of *Yoge*⁽²⁾, as enlarging the vision beyond the material horizon. The practice of *Yoge* or intense meditation was itself the survival of the Vedic *tapas*⁽³⁾, which was a form of asceticism combined with penance. It is not clear whether Kapil himself recognized *Yoge* as the gate-way to higher knowledge, but it was the theme of the grammarian Patanjali, who expounded it in his *Yoge Shastra*, written about 200 B.C. The fact that this work became known as the *Sankhya Pravarachan*, the name given to the later Sankhya Sutras, shows its close association with and recognition by Kapil's school as a part of their system and they are so treated in the Mahabharat. But the futility of the practice of *Yoge* without God, which is still regarded as the most effective means of acquiring occult knowledge and supernatural power,—must have become apparent to its early protagonists ; and Patanjali had to introduce in his system the

(1) Mac. Donnell's *Sanskrit Literature*, "Joining" or "union" (of matter with spirit). 392.

(2) *Sk. Yog* (Lat. *Jugum*—a yoke.) suffering.

(3) *Sk. Tap*—heat, warmth ; pain,

doctrine of a personal God, though he clearly saw its irreconcilable nature, and, therefore, relegated his *sūtras* dealing with God to a place unconnected with his treatise. It was probably a forced concession, intended to stem the tide of speculative reaction. For, in his treatise Patanjali still adhered to the orthodox Sankhya doctrine—that the final aim of man was the absolute isolation of the soul from matter, and not as in the Vedāntic doctrine,—the union with or absorption with God. Nor are the individual souls here derived from the “Special Soul or God, but are like the latter—without a beginning.” (1)

As in *tapas*—suffering without concentration, so in *Yoge*—concentration without suffering—was the chief aim. Both, however, were believed to be conducive to spiritual exaltation, raising the Yogi above the narrow surroundings of the material world and vesting him with a higher power in closer association with God. The Yogi being an aspirant for wresting the secrets of the universe denied to man, was interrupted in his *Ādhyāna* or meditation by the powers of Evil, who by seduction, enticement, force or fraud, sought to disturb him by distracting his attention. This fact accounts for the legendary episodes connected with Mar's interference with Buddha in his meditation.

That Buddha was a firm believer in the efficacy of *Yoge* is clear from the tenour of his earlier life. From the moment of his great renunciation till the day of his deliverance, Buddha was in search of a key to true knowledge. He only found it in *Yoge*. But Buddha believed in *Yoge* as a mental telescope; he did not believe in its efficacy beyond chastening the mind by freeing it from material distractions. It was the pre-Buddhist view. But in later time and by Patanjali, *Yoge* was given a special significance and was maintained to be the chief means of salvation.

What is *Yoge*, then? Bhishm, the great sage, has himself explained it. “Freed from the influence of all pairs of opposites (such as, heat and cold, joy and sorrow etc.) ever exercising them in their own pure state, freed from attachment, never ac-

(1) Macdonnell's *Sanskrit Literature*, p. 397.

cepting anything in gift, they live in places separated from their wives and children, without others with whom disputes may arise, and favourable to perfect tranquillity of heart. There, restraining speech, such a person sits like a piece of wood, killing all the senses, and with mind immersed in the Supreme Self by the help of meditation. He has no perception of sound through the ear, no perception of touch through the skin, no perception of form through the eye, no perception of taste through the tongue."⁽¹⁾

Lest this state of concentration may send the Yogi to sleep, the rules to keep the consciousness awake are provided. The Yogi is to inhale, suspend and expel the breath through each nostril alternatively; then again suspend breath, inhale it to the utmost and exhale it slowly, the eyes are to rest on the tip of the nose and the Yogi must sit in a squatting posture, which he must retain through the performance of his exercise.

The practice of Yoge became popular with the theory—that the soul, when weighed down by the consciousness of material things, cannot rise to higher things; that, therefore, it must be freed from the fetters of mundane consciousness and concentrated upon the thought of Brahm. It would then reach the goal it aspires to reach. Yoge is then the suspension of the ordinary functions of life. It produces temporary death, and as life is the barrier to the union of the two souls—individual and divine,—the Yogi attains that region of heavenly bliss by making himself dead to his earthly surroundings.

The veil being thus raised, he sees the unseen and acquires the larger powers possessed by the larger soul.

It is in the cradle of this system that Buddhism was born. India was not then in communication with the outer world. Confined by the barriers of land and sea, it was left to its own resources to devise its own life. Nevertheless its philosophic system, if purged of the fable and allegories by which it is overlaid, would compare favourably with the trend of contemporary thought elsewhere.

(1) *Mahabharat, Shanti Parv Bk. XII* Ch. 145 § 3-6; 290.

The only other country that can at all compare with the depth and profundity of the Indian thought is Greece and both place knowledge as the means to salvation. It must be remembered that Socrates was born in 469 B.C., that is to say, more than 500 years later than the Vedantists. The Greek philosophy begins with Thales (640-550 B.C.), who was a contemporary of Buddha, as he himself was a contemporary of Croesus and Solon. The quintessence of his thought is contained in the following maxim: "The principle (the *first*, the primitive ground) of all things is water, all comes from water, and to water all returns"⁽¹⁾. His conception of life was founded on observation and experience. He knew that the seed of life cannot grow without water and he concluded that water was, therefore, the beginning and the end of all things. His disciple, Anaximander, maintained that "primitive matter was the eternal, infinite, indefinite ground, from which, in order of time all arises, and into which all returns".

His own disciple, Anaximenes, conceived the principle of the universe to be the "unlimited, all-embracing ever-moving air," from which, by rarefaction (fire) and condensation (water, earth, stone) everything else is formed. His theory rested probably on the fact that he found the air surrounding the globe as necessary to sustain life. Pythagoras (540-500 B.C.) originated the theory of numbers. His view, or rather the view of his school, was that since all things existent had form and measure, the only quality by which they can be identified and distinguished was the number, which was consequently the vital principle of the universe. The Eleatics under Xenophon reduced their system to the fundamental maxim: "Only being is, and non-being is not all". This was the natural deduction from the Pythagorean multiplex system and postulated existence to be compatible only with dividedness in space and successive-ness in time. The system was developed by Parmenides and Zeno who propounded the monistic doctrine that being and thought were one; and so were the body and the soul. He

(1) Shwegler's *History of Philosophy* (Sterlings' Trans)9.

regarded origin and decess, perishable existence, multiplicity and diversity, change of place and alteration of quality, all an illusion or "non-being"—what Vedantist had called, a thousand years before him, *Maya* or a mirage. Zeno, who influenced Plato, developed the same thought by denying the evidence of senses and reduced all beings into "One" which he vaguely defined in the Vedantic sense.

Heracitus held to the doctrine of eternal change, the alternation of life and death, and that the one principle of life is dualism typified by the dualism of life and death. Socrates said of him. "That what he understood was excellent, what not, he believed it to be so; but that the book required a tough swimmer". Leucippus and Democritus (460 B.C.) founded the Atomic theory of Nature, holding that the alternate conjunctions and disjunctions of primordial atoms constituted the universe. His theory, like that of Kapil, was atheistic. But while India welcomed the freedom of thought, Greece banished all free-thinkers like Anaxagoras (born about 500 B.C.) and Protagoras (440 B.C.) who had to leave Athens because they ascribed all Nature to be the mechanical product of cosmic energy. To him mind was a mere hypothesis. The Sophists first led by Protagoras (440 B.C.) revived the doctrine of illusion and denied the objective existence of matter. To them "man is the measure of all things".

He closed the first period of Greek Philosophy. The second begins with Socrates (469-399 B.C.) and was further developed by his disciple—Plato, and the latter's disciple—Aristotle. Socrates never professed to propound any constructive doctrine of his own. His philosophy is, therefore, only an abstraction of his character as expressed in casual conversation. He too was a martyr to his own opinions, for as it is well-known, he was condemned for blasphemy and seducing the young.

Socrates' contribution to philosophy is, like Bacon's *Novum organum*, the introduction of a new method for ascertaining the truth. He had lived his life, removing the cobwebs from

the minds of the young Athenian. His own life was a vivid illustration of his own teaching. For the rest, he shared the popular belief in the supremacy of the gods and the existence of heaven and hell to reward the virtuous and punish the guilty. He was a believer in the doctrine of Karm, for he consigned to Tartarus those who had committed great crimes, while those who had sufficiently purified themselves by philosophy were to live "without bodies, throughout all future time, and shall arrive at habitations yet more beautiful than these, which it is neither easy to describe, nor at present is there sufficient time for the purpose."⁽¹⁾

But he was not quite certain that there was such a thing as soul, though he thought it "most fitting to be believed, and worthy the hazard for one who trusts in its reality; for the hazard is noble and it is right to allure ourselves with such things as with enchantments."⁽²⁾ Socrates was then an agnostic in these matters, but reason failing, he turned to faith to make life agreeable.

But though Socrates founded no school of thought, his disciple—Plato (429-347 B.C.) did. In effect, it is but a development of the Eleatic idealism, in which he denies the existence of matter, but maintains the reality of its idea, that is to say, its subjective conception as distinct from its objective reality.⁽³⁾ He sees an undivine natural principle in the world⁽⁴⁾ and a malevolent world-soul.⁽⁵⁾ His view on the creative energy is not well-developed and is, indeed, not even consistent; for he regarded it either as an emanation of the absolute spirit, or as a verity of a self-existent eternity, or as nothing but a subjective conception and an illusion. "But his main purpose was to combat the theory of dualism and for this purpose he denied the existence of matter, agreeing in this respect with the monistic Vedantic view of Maya, but with the advantage all on the side of the Vedantist; first, because he had anticipated Plato by a 1,000 years; and secondly, because the Vedantist view is explained

(1) *Phædo* 1—Plato's collected works (Bohn), 123.

(2) *Phædo* 1—Plato's collected works (Bohn), 123.

(3) *Parmenides*.

States 268.

(4) *Lysis* X 896.

with a greater assurance and in greater detail, and it has not to make a futile struggle against dualism.”⁽¹⁾ Plato’s idealism was extended to his conception of God whom he regarded as also an “idea of the Good.” His system did not allow of a personal God; for, his absolute idea being universal, his God must be equally so. But Pantheistic though his system led up to be, Plato, like his Master, subscribed to his belief in the traditional faith in God or gods.

The fact is that Plato’s philosophy and his religion were two things apart, and he never attempted to reconcile them. Plato believed in the individual soul which possessed the same characteristics as the universal soul. Through reason it partakes of the divine soul; but so long as it resides in the body, it partakes of its character and, being subject to sensuous feelings and greeds, it descends from the celestial to the earthly, from the immortal to the mortal sphere. Body and soul naturally control each other. The pure soul, which has withstood the proof of association with the corporeal world untainted, returns at death into the state of blissful repose, returning however, after a time to the body. The ultimate end of the soul is its final liberation from its corporeal companionship, which can only be attained by the practice of virtue. The soul which had given itself up to sense, incurs the penalty of migration into new bodies, it may be—even into lower forms of existence, from which it is delivered only when, in the course of time, it has recovered its purity.

All this sounds as if it were an exposition of Buddhism. But it is not. It is pure Platonism and one is curious to know if there was possibly any exchange of ideas between the disciples of the Eastern sage and of the Western idealist; for, the Platonic theory of re-incarnation looks like the paraphrase of the Buddhist doctrine, between which and Platonism there is much more in common.

The Platonic doctrine received a vigorous attack at the hand of his versatile disciple—Aristotle (384-322 B.C.), founder of the

(1) Schwegler’s *History of Philosophy* (Sterling’s Tr.) 80.

Peripetatic school, who may be said to have emulated Kapil in melting all theories down in his crucible of rationalism. As a philosopher, he was an empirist and denounced Plato's ideas—as only “things of sense, immortalised and eternalised,” sterile and as offering no explanation for existence. His system corresponds with that of Kapil in that he recognised the existence of an absolute passive spirit and of the reality of matter and in the case of man, soul as its animating principle. Aristotle rejects the monism of Plato and would equally reject the monism of the Vedantic sages. To him the human soul is a *tabula rasa*, upon which are inscribed the impressions of its impact with matter. But as the human soul is powerless to act without matter, so is the divine soul.


His ethics lays emphasis upon the exercise of virtue, and not merely upon its knowledge. Happiness, to him lies in a perfect activity in a perfect life. Aristotle was the last of the Greek philosophers. After him their productive power declined and became exhausted with the decline of their national life. Zeno (B.—340 B.C.) founded the school of Stoics. To them, God was the active and formative power of matter: the world was its body, and God, its soul. In them there was a revival of the monistic doctrine, though in a different form. God ruled the world. All in it is equally divine, for the divine power equally pervaded all. Everything was subject to His immutable laws, and this law rewarded the good and punished the wicked. Their ethics, expressed in the maxim—“Follow Nature,” or “Live in agreement with Nature,” subjected human acts to the rationality and order of universal Nature: “The touch-stone of virtue is reason.”

Little need be said of Epicurus (342-270 B.C.), founder of the Epicurean school, whose philosophy was practical and defined to be an activity which realises a happy life through ideas and arguments. To them the supreme joy is the joy of spirit, produced by the imperturbable tranquillity of the wise man,—in the feeling of his inner worth, of superiority to the blows of fate. To them the tranquillity of the soul, the impassability of mind, was all in all, though, unlike the cynics, they did not shun plea-

tures of the moment. They know nothing of the moral destiny of man. To them God exists in the empty inter-spaces, in human forms without human-bodies, in perfect bliss, with no duty towards man. This practically closes the last chapter in Grecian philosophy.

Even a casual reader will easily discern the close parallelism between the Indian speculation and Greek thought. It is not easy to speculate how far the two systems were inter-dependent ; but the fact that Indian religious system is several centuries older, makes one feel whether one did not influence the other. But whether it is so or not, the fact remains that the structure of Buddhism was built upon the foundation of Indian Philosophy and that it owes nothing to foreign influences. On the other hand, there is the historical data for inference that in the fourth century B.C., when Alexander visited India, he carried along with him the gems of Buddhist thought and that in his passage back, he acted as the carrier of the new gospel which Buddha had preached and the superb morality which his religion had evolved for the happiness of mankind.

GENEALOGY OF BUDDH (1)



black letters, and (d) denotes Daughters.
the Divya narrative.

er reigned in Kapilvastu, after whom came **Dhanvaberg**.

d the Fair)—Foucaux—*Agga-teser Mollpa* (Tr) 137.

uboli-*Dhammapad* 313. According to R. Davida he was another son by Maya or

, sister of Shuddhodhan. Spence Hardy: *Manual* 226.

rding to Bigandet Prajapati was the sister of Maya, her co-wife and foster-mother of

a of Ikshvaku.

CHAPTER IV.

LIFE OF BUDDH.

From Birth to Enlightenment.

Gautam, who afterwards assumed the title of "the Buddha" or "the Enlightened," was born of Kshatriya parents, 622 years before Christ. His father Shuddhodhan belonged to the Shakya clan of Rajputs, who claimed their descent from the Solar race of the Gautams founded by Ikshvaku. The Kshatriyas or Rajputs, as they were latterly called, all claim their descent from the Sun and the Moon, and their clan falls into the solar or lunar dynasty.

Shuddhodhan was a chieftain of the small state of Kapilvastu or modern Bhinla, in the Province of Oudh, a town lying half-way between Basti and Ajudhia, about 50 miles to the East of Fyzabad and about 20 miles off the right bank of the river Rapti and about 100 miles to the north of Benares. The geographical configuration of the country must have undergone but little change since the days of Gautam.

The country for miles and miles is a rolling plain, abutted on the North by the outskirts of the Himalayas, the annual washings from which have given the surface soil a dark loamy colour in which rice is still the staple crop of the country, while the clusters of tall stately sal-trees testify to the allusion that Gautam was born, married and died in the shade of a sal-grove. The sal is a forest-tree and its timber has no value beyond being used for rafters, beams and for railway-sleepers. It presents a contrast with the ever-green mango which grows in great profusion and presents a pleasant sight of thick and shapely canopy of deep green foliage. The other trees which one notices as variegating the monotony of the plain are the tamarind and peepal. They also grow to a considerable height; but while the tamarind sheds its diminutive foliage in

summer and the tree ■ not even in the best of seasons restful, the mango and the peepal are both giants of the plain, under whose cool arborous shade the weary traveller and cattle alike rest in the scorching heat of the summer. Of these two trees, the peepal ■ sacred to Hinduism, though like the tamarind, which ■ not sacred, it is believed to be the abode of evil spirits.

The sal tree has no place in Hindu mythology ; but being a tree which abounds in the *Ois*-Himalayan plains associated with the exploits of *Buddh*, it is mentioned in the *Buddhistic* scriptures. The climate of the country round about the birth-place of *Buddh* is like that of any place in Northern India : cold in winter and extremely hot in summer. The year is divided into three seasons—each of four months' duration,—namely winter, summer and the rains. The first season lasts from October to March, the second from March to June, and the third from June to October. The temperature in the height of the cold weather descends to about 40°F. and in places, to the freezing point, while in summer it rises even up to 110°F. But the heat in the country round about Gorakhpur is comparatively subdued, and is free from the hot winds which blow like a blast from the furnace in, more southern regions. The inhabitants of this area are Hindus, possessing the pure Aryan type of features ; though as one goes up north on the outskirts of Nepal, one notices an admixture of the Aryan and the Mongolian blood, while in Nepal this admixture becomes pronouncedly marked.

The Shakyas,⁽¹⁾ to which the family belonged, appear to have been a powerful people, while Shuddhodhan,⁽²⁾ if his name is any indication of his character, had acquired the reputation for fair dealing by his tenantry. It is, perhaps, not generally known outside the confines of India that landed-proprietors and persons of opulence in India often acquire a sobriquet, which conveys to the people their out-

(1) *Sk. Shak*—to be powerful; but there is another explanation. *Suk* is the name for the sal tree (*Shorea robusta*) in the forest of which Oclak (Okkak) founder of the clan had settled down. *Buddh* himself

mentions Okkak to be his ancestor who lived on the slopes of the Himalayas in a Salgrove :—*Dialogues* 1—109 ; *M. Vastu* 1—351.

(2) *Sk. Shuddh*—pure ; *oḍan*—rice.

standing quality and which, as often as not, takes the place of the birth name in popular parlance. Shuddhodhan was one such name. The town of Kapilvastu⁽¹⁾ itself was so named. He appears to have been one of the four brothers ruling over a territory about fifty miles in length and thirty to forty miles in width.⁽²⁾ The Shakyas were not only a powerful but a numerous clan, and an old tradition exists that Buddha had 80,000 families of relatives on the father's side and an equal number on the mother's side.⁽³⁾ Allowing six or seven to a family, including the dependants, this would make a total of about a million persons in the Shakya territory. Dr. Rhys Davids thinks that "though the figure is purely traditional and at best a round number (and not uninfluenced by the mystic value attached to it), it is perhaps not so very far from what we might expect"⁽⁴⁾.

It must be remembered that in these early days the Hindus had not become rigidly divided by caste, though the Kshatriyas, as the nobles, had a social status above that of the Brahmans,⁽⁵⁾ and it would be more correct to speak of them as a clan or a family or *Kul*, since the basis of social cohesion was relationship. "The exact use of the term did not exist till long afterwards,"⁽⁶⁾ and when it did come into being, it was but another name for clan. The caste-system, in any proper or exact use of the term, did not come into existence till long afterwards, and when it did come into existence, it was, so far as the Kshatriyas were concerned, but another name for clan. But "it is no more accurate to speak of caste, at Buddha's time in India, than it would be to speak of it at the same time, in Italy or Greece. There is no word even for caste. The words often wrongly rendered by that modern expression (itself derived from a Portuguese word)

(1) Sk. *Kapil-red Vastu*-earth i.e. "of red earth." The present writer found no trace of red earth; but Swinton (p. 33) mentions "red spots resembling carbonate of iron" in the sandy beds under the surface of the yellow earth; and Martin (1-203) says of the Gorakhpur District: "No soil of a red colour was observed on the surface, although earth of this kind may be produced by digging," to which Oldenberg adds: "This is quite sufficient if we consider the changes caused in the

earth's surface by inundations in the course of more than 2000 years, to explain the same" *I. Buddha* f.n. pp. 99, 100.

(2) Rhys Davids' "*Buddhist India*," 20.

(3) Buddhaghosh—"Dialogues of Buddha"—147 note; cited in Rhys Davids' "*Buddhist India*" 18.

(4) "*Buddhist India*" pp. 18, 19.

(5) See 46 ante; "*Buddhist India*," 61.

(6) *Buddhist India*, 62.

have nothing to do with the question, but do not mean caste." (1)

Shuddhodhan, the father of Gautam, was one of the five sons of Sinhahanu, a ruling prince of Kapil, in feudal alliance with the king of Koushal. He had at least two wives by whom he had three sons. His family was closely related to the neighbouring prince of Koli by frequent inter-marriages, it being the rule for the two families to exchange children in marriages.

The Tibetan legends, confirmed by Buddh (2), trace Gautam's history to a remote ancestor Maheshwar-Sen who reigned in Kushinagar. He was succeeded by his descendant Karnik, who had two sons Gautam and Bharadwaj. Gautam renounced the world and took to asceticism, whereupon Bharadwaj succeeded him. On his dying issueless his nephew Ikshvaku became king. Ikshvaku was one of the two sons of Gautam found in a sugar plantation (3) and brought up by his preceptor Krishna Varna, later on known as Kanak Varna. One hundred of his descendants reigned in Patal, the last of which was Ikshvaku Virudhak. The following genealogy is compiled from the history of his descendants. This Ikshvaku was the father of four sons, when he married again on condition that if his wife bore a son, he should be a king. After a while, she had a son named either Rajyanand or Janta, who was accordingly declared his successor, and by way of precaution, all the four sons by the first wife were exiled. They took with them their sisters and built huts on the banks of the Ganges, where they lived by hunting. Following the advice of a sage Kapil, (who, as Buddh declared, was he himself in a previous birth) who had welcomed them, they married their sisters; (4) and they settled down on land given by him on which they built a town which they named Kapilvastu or ("The soil of Kapil"). King Virudhak asked one day what had become of his exiled sons and his courtiers told him of their successful exploits, whereupon he exclaimed—"The daring young men! the daring young men", and from this day they became known as the Shakyas (5). When they

(1) *Buddhist India* 62.

(2) "Jataka" Rys. Davids p. 65.

(3) "Ikshvaku" means "sugar-cane plantation."

(4) The legend says "by different mothers," but the tale mentions only two wives.

■ *Legende 9-13 VI, Tibetan.*

became numerous, they built another town on an adjacent spot made known to them by a Dev, which they named Devadah, ⁽¹⁾ afterwards known also as Koli, ⁽²⁾ with whose families it became customary for the Shakyas to inter-marry. They had decided to adhere to monogamy, but an exception was occasionally made by permitting polygamy, as in the case of Shuddhodhan, who as a young prince, had been sent out by his father to subdue the Pandava hill-tribe, who had been raiding his territory.

Beal opines that the Shakyas were in their origin Scythians, who conquered Assyria and Darius, and subsequently the whole Eastern world under Timur and Changez Khan. He bases his inference on four facts—*first*, that the Scythians were so called because they were famous archers and have been so mentioned by Herodotus ⁽³⁾. Lenormant says that the word is derived from the Gothic word "*Skiatha*" an archer; ⁽⁴⁾ *secondly*, they venerated their ancestors' tombs; ⁽⁵⁾ *thirdly*, they erected stupas over their graves; and *fourthly*, that Buddha had left explicit directions that he should be buried according to the old system of Chakravartis or "Wheel Kings." ⁽⁶⁾ But these reasons do not appear even plausible, much less conclusive; since, the Kshatriyas, who are professional warriors, must be equally good archers, while ancestor-worship is a common feature of the East and extends alike both to Aryans and Mongolians; while the erection of stupas was consequent on a royal funeral accorded to Chakravartis, which is as much a Hindu as a Kshatriya institution. Moreover, the fact that Buddha prided himself upon being an Arya and a Kshatriya disposes of the conjecture as to his ancestry.

The annexed genealogical tree shows Buddha's close connections as also Siddhartha's other relations.

⁽¹⁾ Beal "*Romantic Legend*" 23:

"*Jataka*"—Ry. Davids 65.

⁽²⁾ *Spence Hardy* 140.

⁽³⁾ *Herodotus* I-103, 106.

⁽⁴⁾ *Lenormant* II—127.

⁽⁵⁾ *Herodotus* IV—127.

⁽⁶⁾ Beal's "*Gautama*"—Ch. II—126—130.

Siddharth, otherwise known as Gautam, and afterwards the Buddha, ⁽¹⁾ was apparently the only son of his father, born ■ Maya Devi—daughter of Suprabuddh—who died only seven days after her confinement. The care of the child devolving on her sister Prajapati who acted as his step-mother, as she was also the co-wife of the King, and had by him a son and a daughter. The *Lalit Vistar* thus describes Gautam's conception : "When the winter was over, in the month of Baishakh, the Bodhisatv descended from the beautiful Tusitabode, his head cochineal coloured, teeth streaked with gold, complete with all limbs and parts of limbs and faultless in every organ." The only fact of historical value is the month of conception, so that in ordinary course Gautam must have been born in January,⁽²⁾ though Buddhists now observe the full moon day of Baishakh as his birthday for celebration.

Maya dreamt of the entry of the white elephant into her womb, sent for the King and informed him of it. He sent for the Brahmans who interpreted the dream to her as follows :—"A son shall be born unto thee, his body adorned with tokens, worthy descendant of the royal race, a noble ruler of the world. When he forsakes love, royal power and palace, and without giving any more thought to them, wanders forth in pity for the whole world, he will become a Buddha, to be honoured by the three worlds and he will make glad the universe with the marvellous nectar of immortality."⁽³⁾ In due course, Gautam was born in one of the garden-palaces,

(1) Other names and titles were bestowed on him by which he ■ referred to in the scriptures: For example, he is referred to as—

1. *Aditya Bandhu* (*Aditya*—Sun, *Bandhu*—kinsman—"Kinsman of the Sun.")

■ *Ashram Suran* (*Ashrama*—*Shorana*—"Refuge of the Refugees.")

3. *Bhagwat* (The Lord)

4. *Bhargav* (*Bhargava*—"The Blessed Lord.")

5. *Chakravarti* ("Universal monarch," "monarch of the globe.")

6. *Jin* (*Jina*—conqueror).

7. *Maha purush*—Great man.

■ *Mahavir* (*Maha*—great, *Vir*—hero).

9. *Shakyamuni* (or Sage of the Shakya clan).

10. *Shakya Sinha* ("Lion of the Shakyas").

11. *Shast* (*Shasta*—"The Teacher.")

12. *Siddharth* ("One who has fulfilled the object" of his coming).

13. *Sraman* (*Samana*—"The ascetic.")

14. *Swagat* ("Welcome.")

15. *Tathagata* (*Tatha*—the same, *Gata*—goes—"One who comes and goes as his predecessors, i.e. the Buddhas).

(2) Gautam born after 10 months; *Id.* p. 27.

■ *Lalit Vistar* 22-23.

known as the Lumbini park of the King.⁽¹⁾ Hearing of his birth a great and aged sage—by name Asit—accompanied by his sister's son—Nardatt—came to see the child and saw in him the thirty-two chief signs and eighty additional signs of the future deliverer of the world. The birth of the prince was made the occasion of great rejoicings in the town which was decorated, and through the streets, sprinkled with perfumes and strewn with flowers, he was taken to the temple to be presented to the gods whose images are said to have come to life and which threw themselves upon the infant's feet.

In due course the child was put to school under the tutelage of Vishwamitr⁽²⁾ who must have imbued him with sacred learning which children of the twice-born were privileged to receive. His studies would necessarily include a study of the Vedas, which children of the highest caste and of noble houses were privileged to recite by heart, in addition to which they would be taught grammar and arithmetic: writing was then taught on wooden slates, in his case, made of sandal wood, of a rich colour edged with gold and encrusted with jewels.⁽³⁾ His fellow-students were sons of Councillors, with three of whom, as he grew older, he went out to see a village of farmers, where he roamed about here and there, aimless, alone, and without a companion, and espying a Jambu tree in the forest, he sat down his legs crossed, in meditation.

The King took this to indicate the young prince's inclination; and in order to break him off his newly formed habit, he cast about for a suitable bride. Several eligible maidens were found; but as the young Prince was not easy to please, he was requested to make his own choice. Five hundred beautiful girls

(1) ■ seems her father had requested the king to "let the Queen come and give birth here." *M. Vastu II*—18; "A Hindu-temple close by now contains a representation in stone of the Birth of Buddha from the side of Queen Maya." *Thomas life* 19; Ashoke had a pillar erected to commemorate the event; and freed Lumbini from taxes and reduced rent to only an eighth part of the produce—Hultzsch "*Inscriptions of Ashoke*" 169.

Lumbini, now called Ruumendai, a pillar discovered by Dr. Fuhrer on 1st

December 1926, nine feet above the ground. Its inscription, which was clear, stated by Ashoke to commemorate the birth-place of Gautam Buddha.

(2) The above quotations are from the *Lalit Vistar* which depicts the life of Buddha in frescoes at Brarbudar in Java. The frescoes are religious in their character and depict the life as depicted by the devout. It will be only referred to hereafter wherever a fact of historical value can be gleaned out of it.

(3) *Lalit Vistar*, 43.

paraded before him, but he dismissed them all with costly jewels. One amongst them, who came late, was Gopi, the daughter of Dandapani of the Shakya clan—his own cousin. She looked Gautam in the face after he had given away all the magnificent ornaments, then, with a merry look she said: "Prince, what have I done that you despise me?" To which the Prince replied: "I don't despise you but, you came last of all." And so saying, he took from his finger a costly ring and gave it to her. She was thus selected to be his wife; but her father objected to her marrying a man who had never shewn any proficiency in learning or sport. Gautam's father asked him if he was able to show any proficiency, and on the son declaring his ability, he fixed a date and caused it to be proclaimed throughout the city by the ringing of bells: "In seven more days shall the Prince shew his skill. Let all those exercised in all skill assemble together."

On the appointed day, the first person to appear on the scene was his own cousin Dev Datt. This gentleman was his early rival and life-long enemy. On this occasion he was beside himself with jealousy, and seeing a white elephant of great size brought into the city, he laid hold of it by the trunk with his left hand and killed it with one blow of the right. Then came after him Prince Sundarnand, who asked the multitude who had killed the elephant. They named Dev Datt. "It is an evil deed of Dev Datt" he exclaimed, and seizing the carcass of the animal by the tail he threw it outside the city gate. Gautam came next and made a similar inquiry: "Who has killed it?" The crowd answered, "Dev Datt." "This is an evil deed of Dev Datt. And by whom was it dragged outside the gate?" They replied, "By Sundarnand." "That" said the Prince, "is a good deed of Sundarnand. Yet this beast hath such a great carcass that when it rots, it will fill the whole city with stench." Then standing on the carriage, he put out one foot to the ground; and with his great toe lifted up the elephant by the tail, and hurled it over seven walls and seven moats, till it was a Kose (2 miles) distant from the city.



(3) Sarnath, Red Stone Statue of a figure—standing posture.

There were 500 other Shakya youths against whom Gautam successfully competed in calligraphy and arithmetic, archery and wrestling. Dandapani was satisfied; and so was Gopi, who had been watching the sports unveiled—for which she was reproved; but she retorted that those who had their senses under control required no veil—which satisfied King Shuddhodhan. This episode is instructive in that it shows that women in Buddh's time usually remained veiled from their elder relations, and respectable strangers, e.g., the father-in-law, the husband's elder brother (but not his younger brother) and the rest. That Gopi appeared unveiled before a motley crowd of sight-seers shows, however, that *purdah* was not then strictly observed, nor its non-observance seriously resented.

After the tournament, Gautam was married to Gopi, and she was given the name of Yashodhara and became his senior wife. He took two more wives, namely Yashoda and Utpal Varu; but these two junior wives appear to play no further part in the life-story of Gautam. The story of Gautam's miraculous conception, birth and marriage by *Swayamvar*⁽¹⁾ must not be taken to be necessarily consonant with facts, though the legendary account is often repeated without comment. The fact is, that similar accounts are given of the lives of the Pandavas in the *Mahabharat*, and of Ram in the *Ramayan*. But in the present case there is more than one reason to treat the incident as a transparent imagery and inconsistent with the other recited facts, and such are the other legends mentioned in the sequel. So far as regards his marriage, it is clear that Gautam himself had selected his bride. Her father had agreed to give her to him in marriage, but before giving his final consent, he wished to allay his doubts about his ability and prowess. This must have been known to all the Shakyas and delicacy would have dictated discretion in entering the lists with Gautam. Again, Gautam's father was a rigidly orthodox Hindu, and the marriages of Hindus then,

(1) Sk. *Swyam-sam Var-matoh*, Lit: "Selection by a woman of her own husband" A form of Hindu marriage pre-

valent in the classic age when the woman offered herself in marriage to the winner of an open tournament.

as now, are made in heaven. They do not select their wives themselves. The selection depends upon casting of the horoscopes and the proved affinity of the ruling planets of the parties to be married which is left to the calculation of the Brahman-priest.

The available records do not show at what age Gautam was married; but judging from the fact that he was old enough to perform those feats of arms in competition with his competitors, he must have been pretty old when he got married. Hindus in those days, as now, married young—the usual age for scions of well-to-do families being twelve to fourteen, married to girls aged eight to ten years. This is in accordance with the inculcation of Manu who had laid down the age of eight as sufficient for a girl's marriage,⁽¹⁾ though in the case of boys adult marriage is held preferable.⁽²⁾

However, whatever the age of Gautam's marriage, one thing is certain that he had now agreed to enter the state of an ordinary householder, and that whatever his early proclivities towards meditation and asceticism, they had been overcome by the appearance of a vivacious and a beautiful bride. It is quite clear that when married, she could not have been under sixteen, probably more; while one may hazard a guess that Gautam must then be about twenty. That this is not wholly imaginary will be apparent from the fresco scenes depicted in the *Lalit Visatar* and at Ajanta.

Of Buddh's relations at this time, we know only two. Both were his cousins—one of them, Dev Datt, to whom reference has already been made, became early jealous of his success and later in life developed into his implacable foe, the other, Anand was always deeply attached to him, became one of his earliest disciples and was his constant companion and trusted friend. We do not hear of any other relations, though the family of the Shakyas being numerous

(1) *Manu Ch.* IX—88;

(2) *Manu* IX—94:—"A man aged 30 years may marry a girl of 12 and if he finds one dear to his heart; or a

he finished his studentship earlier, and the duties of his next order would otherwise be impeded, let him marry immediately."

and powerful, it is but natural that Gautam must have had other relations, though we know nothing about them.

The usual rule with a Kshatriya prince is that upon his marriage, the heir-apparent is inducted into the affairs of the State, being usually allotted the task of Chief Minister or other important functionary, according to his proclivity and aptitude. But it does not appear that Gautam was assigned any such duties. As a lad he had shown himself to be of a retiring, contemplative disposition; and it is probably the reason why Dandapani objected to give his daughter in marriage to a boy, however highly placed, without proof of his prowess. If this part of the version of his life be believed, it contradicts the other account depicted in the *Lalit Vistar* that in his learning he had out-mastered his master. ¶ Gautam had been an infant prodigy—which he is represented by the devout sculptor to be, two things are certain: Dandapani would never have hesitated to give his daughter in marriage; and if he did, the sports must have been a mere display, and not the serious competition they are represented to be. Again, the maiden modesty of the Kshatriya girls would prevent their joining in a beauty-competition for the hand of Gautam in the manner depicted, all of which appears to be a histrionic embellishment added for effect, though there seem good grounds for believing that Gautam was indisposed to enter into the bondage of marriage, and that he evaded his father's proposal for it till his marriage by *Swayam-var* (courtship) was resolved upon. Indeed, the entire series of frescoes, which depict the life of Buddha must be taken with a grain, in fact, many grains of salt. They are held to embody a modicum of truth, and European scholars have largely drawn upon them, but the fact remains that they were tributes of the devout who had to draw upon their imagination for glorifying the life of their revered Teacher, whom they had begun to adore as God. The same remarks apply to his miraculous conception in the form of a white elephant. Such animal, being rare, is greatly prized and is classed as a sacred symbol of Buddhist faith. The elephant-god,

Ganesh is the Hindu god of wisdom, and the white elephant is only an improvement on him.

Of the personal appearance of the Perfect One, we know directly very little. His images, though innumerable, give no clue to his figure or features; since they have been moulded according to the type of features, prevalent in the country of the sculptor. In some cases, they are allegorical and in all cases, unreliable. For instance, take the height. The images vary from a few inches to colossal height, say, up to 70 feet; and the pious Buddhist verily believes that he was as tall as he is represented. They are even endowed with life. They are mostly carved in stone, though some are made of gold, brass, marble, sandal-wood and clay, in varying postures, some recumbent, but mostly sedant or in the squatting position.

As many of these statues stand singly, it is not possible to guess his height by comparison with other figures. They are all stated to be self-created, even by the artist who fashions them. So far then as his height is concerned, we have no reliable data. Prof. Monier-Williams thinks that Buddha was probably tall even for an up-country Indian, where the average of a man's stature is about five feet eight or nine inches.⁽¹⁾ He would then make Buddha a six-footer, but there is not the least justification for it. In the first place, the average height of an up-country Indian is not what the Professor has estimated it to be. In the second place, there is no reason to suppose that Buddha was above the average. On the other hand, if this were the fact, his earliest biographer would not have failed to notice it. On the contrary, in the earliest frescoes and paintings now extant, Buddha is not given any prominence in point of height. A conjecture has been hazarded that the Shakyas were a nomadic tribe who entered from Tibet and Northern Asia and that they became assimilated with the Aryan Hindu and were admitted into the Kshatriya caste. There is again no data for this, any more than for the conjecture that Buddha was a negro because he is depicted as possessing curly hair!⁽²⁾ But even if there were, it would be

(1) "*Buddhism*" p. 477.

Williams "*Buddhism*," 474 f.n. (3).

(2) Seriously so held—See fact noted in

one more argument against assuming Buddh to be of any but the normal height, since these immigrants from the North belong to the Mongolian stock, and are ordinarily squat and square-built people with their slanting eyes peculiar to that race. The Gurkha, who hails from Nepal, is probably the best known example of this race.

So much for the height. Turning next to his features we are again confronted by a want of unanimity; though on this point, it is not so marked. The one organ which some of his images undoubtedly exaggerate is the ear, which in some is shown as long and reaching up to the shoulder.⁽¹⁾ Even in the colossal figure, discovered in Buddh-Gaya, which is bearing the year corresponding to 142 A.D., this abnormality is easily noticeable. But whether it was intended to be true to nature or was merely to symbolize a trait, one cannot say. The ears are elephantine, and actually touch the shoulder in the statues placed in the external niches of the Buddh-Gaya temple before its restoration. But the fact remains that other statues and images do not emphasize this aural deformity.

That Buddh wore short hair after his renunciation may be taken for granted; for had he not cut off his tresses with his sword to signalize his abandonment of the world? Before that event, however, he wore long tresses, dressed and combed them and had them flowing down to the neck. It was the fashion in those days. In the statues and images in which Gautam is depicted bare-headed, his short hairs are shown as curly, probably because the possession of curls was believed to be an auspicious sign.⁽²⁾ But in most statues and images his head is covered with a serpent-coil, as the emblem of eternity. The ascetic form of the Hindu god Shiv is represented as wearing a serpent withal. In the case of Buddh, it has the added significance of commemorating the legend—that during his period of meditation he was about to be overwhelmed by a storm when the serpent Mesalind came to his

(1) The elongation of the lobes is probably intended to typify his noble birth, as scions of noble houses then wore heavy discs, ear pendants, rings

and other ornamentations.

(2) M. Williams "Buddhism," 474 f.n. (3).

rescue and coiled his body round him and stretched his hood over his head for shelter. The top of this coil shows a protuberance, which is a copy of the Hindu ascetic's coil of hair, tied up in a fore-knot or a chignon. The eyes and the eyebrows in the statues are both of the curved Aryan type: so is the nose, in some—aquiline, in others flat—with the nostrils wide and protruding, and the bridge low. This is characteristically marked in the second century statue, now in the Calcutta Museum. In this, the lips are carved thick,—a trait reproduced in some later images. The general contour of the face, in these and other representations, is certainly of the handsome man he is described to be. Of this there can be no doubt; and it can be concluded from the incidental references to his person in an ancient poem, which describes his visit to Rajgrah after his renunciation, and the visit to him by its king, who dissuaded him from turning a monk, adding "young, thou art and delicate, a lad in his first youth, fine is thy colour, like a high-born noble's."⁽¹⁾ And similarly, the first Brahman sage he went to, exclaimed "Behold! see the noble appearance of that man"⁽²⁾ which meant tall and stately. But the art of statuary was never much advanced in India; and the sculptor in every case, appears to have blended his notion of the Hindu ascetic practising Yoge, of which he has added allegorical trappings and given the whole the conventional appearance of mental abstraction.

The common features of all statues, however, are that they are invariably draped, the cloth covering the body the right shoulder being left bare, in striking contrast to the images of Mahabir—the founder of Jainism and the later Jain saints. It faithfully represents Gautam's dissent from the combined doctrines of the Hindu ascetic, as those of his contemporary founder of the Jain religion and his cousin Dev Dutt, who had, out of pique, joined that creed. In Nepal many images are found of Buddh holding the alms-bowl, but these are not common elsewhere.

(1) "*Prabhajja Sutta*" § 16 cited in Rhys Davids' "*Buddhism*" 101. (2) *Lalit Victor* 79.

The Hindus apply a mark of sandal-wood paste on their face as the symbol of their caste. Some of Buddha's images represent this caste-mark on the fore-head, but it is certainly not true to life, as Buddha's whole life was spent in decrying caste and its outward show: "Not nakedness, not matted hair, not dirt, not fasting, not lying on the ground, not smearing with ashes, not sitting motionless—can purify a mortal, who has not overcome desires."⁽¹⁾

Nothing is known, nor can be definitely ascertained of Gautam's home-life after his marriage. The legends connected with his mental attitude towards the great world, culminating in the decisive step he took in his twenty-ninth year, are however, numerous. From their recital, they all appear to be apocryphal, but some of them will be given here to shew what treaders in the same path conceived to have been the punctuating periods of his intervening life. They are all depicted in the *Lalit Vistār*.

The years following his marriage were spent in the regal splendour of an Oriental Court. Shuddhodhan had built for his Prince three palaces, in which to beguile his time, adapted to the three seasons of the year. The women attendants regale him with dancing and music, which for the nonce turn Gautam's thoughts away from his growing melancholy. But Gautam soon recovers himself. He feels sated with the pleasure offered to him. He yearns for a change. His father had taken care to see that the young Prince was made a prisoner in his own home. He was surrounded by courtiers, attendants, sentinels and guards, while he was free to enjoy "the five incomparable kinds of love, and the young women were always near him with music, song and dance."⁽²⁾ Even the gods are seduced by this company; but Gautam feels satiated, and other thoughts awaken in him, and he orders his chariot to go to the pleasure-garden. He emerges from the gate of his palace, headed by a military escort of soldiers, clearing the way with drawn swords in hand. The carriage and pair is driven by a coachman, while an attendant holds a golden umbrella over him. His retinue follow him, but as he pro-

(1) *Dhammapad*.

(2) *Lalit Vistār Plate* ■ p. 61.

ceeds to his palace, he receives the first shock of his life : for he sees in front of him on the road "an old man, aged, worn out, with swollen veins on his body and broken teeth, wrinkled and grey-haired, bent, crooked as a root, broken, leaning on a stick, feeble, without youth, his throat uttering inarticulate sounds, his body bent and supported by a staff, trembling in all his limbs and parts of limbs."⁽¹⁾ Seeing this decrepit figure, Gautam inquired of his charioteer : "What human form is this, so miserable and so distressing, the like of which I have never seen before ?" The charioteer replied : "This is what is called an old man."

It is curious that the Prince required the charioteer to tell him what every child would know ; and the Prince was a Bodhisatv sent down from Heaven for the salvation of mankind. But such is the legend, this and others to follow.

The Prince inquired : "And what is the exact meaning of this expression 'old' ?"

The charioteer answered : "Old age implies the loss of bodily power, decay of the vital functions, and failure of mind and memory. This poor man before you is old and approaching his end."

Then asked the Prince : "Is this law universal ?"

"Yes," he replied, "this is the common lot of all living creatures. All that is born, must die."⁽²⁾

On another occasion, as he was proceeding to his pleasure garden, he saw on the road a man sick of a disease, overcome by hot fever, his body exhausted, soiled by his own excreta, without any one to help him, without shelter and breathing with difficulty.

The Prince inquired of his charioteer : "Who is this unhappy being ?" The charioteer replied : "This is a sick man, and such sickness is common to all."

(1) *Lalit Vistara* Plate 56 p. 62.

(2) The details in this and the next three legends are not in the *Lalit Vistara* :

but are taken from the Chinese version of *Abhinisk Kraman Sutra* (Beal's translation).

On his third round he saw a dead man carried on a bier.

Then asked the Prince: "Who is this, borne onwards on his bed, covered with strangely coloured garments, surrounded by people weeping and lamenting?"

"This" replied the charioteer, "is called a dead body, he has ended his life; he has no further beauty of form and no desires of any kind; he is one with the stones and the felled tree; he is like a ruined wall, or fallen leaf; no more shall he see his father or mother, brother or sister, or either relatives; his body is dead, and your body also must come to this."

On the fourth occasion the Prince saw a monk standing on the road, quiet, tranquil, full of discretion and self-control, not allowing his glance to wander, nor looking farther than the length of a yoke, having attained the path that brings peace of mind and honour, showing that peace of mind in his forward and his backward steps, peace of mind in the looking and the turning away of his eyes, peace of mind in his bending and his stretching, peace of mind in the wearing of his coat, begging-bowl and monk's frock.

"Who is this?" the Prince inquired. "This man," said the charioteer, "devotes himself to charity, and restrains his appetites and his bodily desires. He hurts nobody, but does good to all, and is full of sympathy for all."

Then the Prince asked the ascetic to give an account of his condition.

He replied:—"I am called a homeless ascetic; I have forsaken the world, relatives and friends; I seek deliverance for myself and desire the salvation of all creatures, and I do harm to none."

The sight of the monk, uncared-for and still care-free, had fired his imagination, and would have led to his immediate renunciation, were it not for the fact that as he mounted his chariot, he received the tidings of the birth of a son. He says: "Rahula is born to me, a fetter has been forged for me." He returns home; and as he alights from his car, his eyes

fall upon a princess standing on the balcony of the palace. Seeing him, she exclaims: "Happy the repose of the mother, happy the repose of the father, happy the repose of the wife, whose ■ such a husband." The prince thinks to himself—"Well might she say that a blessed repose enters the hearts of mother, when she beholds such a son, and blessed repose enters the heart of a father and the heart of a wife. But when comes the repose which brings happiness to the heart?"—to which he himself gives the answer—"When the fire of lust is extinguished, when the fire of hatred and infatuation is extinguished, when ambition, error, and all sins and sorrows are extinguished, then the heart finds happy repose."

Moved by his own thoughts, the Prince approached his father and said: "I wish to become a wandering ascetic⁽¹⁾ and to seek Nirvan; all worldly things, Oh King! are changeable and transitory." The King wished to divert the young Prince's thoughts by reinforcing the women's apartments, and ordered: "Let music never cease; let all kinds of play and amusement be provided simultaneously. Let the women use all their powers of attraction and bewitch the Prince, so that his spirit is dimmed by pleasure, and he will not go away to wander as a monk."

But the King soon found this unavailing; for, Gautam, who had decided to become a monk, said to himself: "It would not become me and would shew ingratitude, were I to leave without informing the King, and without taking his consent." He entered the palace and presented himself before the King, and spake, "Hinder me no more, and be not sorrowful thereat, for the hour of my departure, O King, is come. Therefore be content, O Prince, thou and thy people and thy realm."

The King endeavoured to turn him from his purpose and fought against his son's desire; but finding him obdurate, he at last gave way and spake: "It is thy desire to bring by redemption salvation to the world; let the aim thou hast set before thee be achieved."

(1) Sk. "Parivrajak."

Next morning the King called together the whole company of Shakyas and apprised them of the matter : " The Prince will depart ; what must now be done ? " The Shakyas answered : " We will keep guard over him, O King ;—for why, we are a great company of Shakyas and he is but alone. How shall he be able to force a way to depart ? " The guards were accordingly doubled and the sensuous pleasures increased. But Gautam felt that in the midst of life he was in death. He beheld the sight of his women lying dead in sleep, " some with their garments torn away, others with dishevelled hair, some whose ornaments were all fallen off, others with broken diadems, some whose shoulders were bruised, and others with naked limbs, and mouths awry and squinting eyes and some slobbering....." " And meditating on the idea of purity, and penetrating the idea of impurity, he saw that from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head, the body originates in impurity, is compounded of impurity, and exhales impurity without end." At this time he spoke this verse : " O hell of living beings, with many entrances ; dwelling-place of death and age, what wise man having looked thereon, would not consider his own body to be his enemy ? "

He had now finally made up his mind to renounce the world. At midnight he roused his faithful charioteer—Chandak from his sleep, and said : " Quick, Chandak, delay not, bring me my prince of horses decked with all his ornaments. My salvation is about to be fulfilled ; and this day will it surely be accomplished." Chandak naturally felt grieved to hear these words, and wished to dissuade his young master from taking such step. But Gautam was firm. He said " Discourage me now no more, Chandak, bring my Kanthak caparisoned without delay." Chandak had no option but to obey. The horse was ready and so was the rider. No, not yet. For, as Gautam emerged from his bed-chamber, a thought crossed him : " I will see my child—" It was just seven days old. (1) And he retraced his steps to his wife's bed-chamber and found her sleeping on a flower-strewn couch, with her hand spread over the child's

(1) *Jatāk*, 172.

head. Then the thought occurred to him : " If I move her hand from his head to clasp my child, she will awake." He reflected : " Distressing is life at home, a state of impurity ; freedom is in leaving home." While he reflected thus he left home.

" The ascetic Gautam has gone from home into homelessness, while still young, young in years, in the bloom of youthful strength, in the first freshness of life. The ascetic Gautam, although his parents did not wish it, although they shed tears and wept, has had his hair and beard shaved, has put on yellow garments, and has gone from his home into homelessness."

Gautam was 29 when he left his home.

CHAPTER V

THE GREAT RENUNCIATION.

Seven years of Preparation.

It has already been seen that in leaving the comforts of home to the discomforts of a nomadic life, Gautam was following the inculcations of the Hindu scriptures which divide the life of a Brahman into three stages—the last being spent in the wood. That stage had come in the life of Gautam, for he had passed his childhood in study, and his youth as a householder, the termination of which is marked not by the lapse of years but by the birth of a son—which is a signal for the father to depart. ⁽¹⁾ The third stage is to be passed in the forest, in contemplation and study, and preparation for the hereafter. He was to feed on roots and fruits and practise the severest austerity. This was the stage of *Van-prasth*. ⁽²⁾ The fourth and last stage was that of a Sanyasi. ⁽³⁾ He is then presumably old and infirm; but would eat nothing but what was given to him unasked and abide not more than one day in any village, lest the vanities of the world should find entrance in his heart. He must, of course, abstain from intoxicating drinks, practise charity, curb his desires and keep his mind fixed on contemplation and study; for, “what is this world? It is even as the bough of a tree, on which a bird rests for a night, and in the morning flies away.” ⁽⁴⁾

It is this life that Gautam's thoughts had turned to, when he experienced the wretchedness and misery of man. And it is, therefore, to the Brahmans that he first directed his steps. And as he left his home, on that lonely dark night, accompanied by his horseman—Chandak, with a drawn sword at the rear,

(1) According to Manu this stage is reached in the case of a Brahman on the procreation of a son—(*Manu* VI—2 *Jones Tr.* p. 119) and in the case of other castes, when a person sees “the child of his child.” *Manu* VI—2 (*Jones Tr.* 116).

(2) Sk. *Van*—forest, *Prasth*—dweller; “Forest dweller”.

(3) Sk. *Sanyas*—asceticism.

(4) He himself had undergone a similar experience in a previous life. *U Jautak* No. 539; (*Camb*) 19—37.

Gautam said to himself : "Why do I want a horse and a horseman to accompany me ? And why do I want these ornaments ? And why do I need these flowing tresses and this gorgeous attire ?" So, as he emerged from the city-gate and was well clear of it, he stopped his horse, removed the tiara from his head and cut off his hair with a sword. He undraped himself ; and collecting the tiara and the ornaments in a bundle, delivered them to Chandak, and proceeded alone on foot. As he proceeded, a thought struck him. "I have parted with my tiara and other ornaments. Why do I don this gorgeous attire ?" Meanwhile, he met a hunter passing his way. He wore a russet dress. He proposed to him the exchange of garments, saying : "If thou, worthy man, givest me thy russet dress, I will give thee these Kaushik robes." He answered : "Those garments suit you and these suit me." Gautam implored him to make the exchange, and finally it was made. He donned the garb of a hermit and then proceeded to the cells of two Brahman hermits by name Shaki and Padma who gave him food and shelter, but no mental instruction.

Meanwhile, as was to be expected, when the King heard next morning of his son's disappearance, he was disconsolate. Chandak strolled back with the empty horse and told him of the Prince's disappearance in the forest. The entire household went into mourning, and Gautam's wife reminded the King of the monarchs of old, including his own ancestors, who had gone into the forest with their wives. At any rate, for the sake of his child, he should not have left her alone. The wailings of the people, as they heard of the news, added to the wild cries of the King's household. A search-party was organized to find him ; and the minister with the family-priest, "beaten by the King with his scourge of tears," mounted their steeds and made a dash for the forest, where they met one Bhargava Brahman, who informed the party that Gautam had gone towards Arao seeking liberation. Thither they went and found him, and persuaded him to return, if only for the sake of his father, wife and child. But Gautam was obdurate. He said, "Who would not wish to see his dear kindred, if but this separation from beloved ones

did not exist ? But who can avoid separation, since parting is inevitably fixed in the course of time for all beings, just as for travellers who have joined company on the road. What wise man would cherish sorrow when he loses his kindred, even though he loves them ? Leaving his kindred in another world, he departs hither ; and having stolen away from them here, he goes forth once more—such is the lot of mankind.” To which the minister replied, “ Surely the mind is not very penetrating, or it is unskilled in examining duty, wealth and pleasure—when, for the sake of an unseen result, thou departest, disregarding a visible end. Some say that there is another birth, others confidently assert that there is not : since then the matter is all in doubt, is it not right to enjoy the good fortune which comes into thy hand ? If there is a life hereafter, we shall enjoy in it as we can, but if there be no life, then there is liberation without any effort. Some say there is a future life without the possibility of liberation ; that it is its inherent property, and that all this world arises spontaneously, and that all our effort is in vain.” He then quoted the example of Ram and other classic heroes who returned home after their exile. But Gautam said that they were no authorities ; for, in determining duty “ how canst thou quote an authority of those who have broken their vows ?” He concluded : “ Even the sun may fall to the earth, even the mountain Haimavat may lose its firmness ; but never would I return to my home as a man of the world, with no knowledge of the truth, and my senses only alert for external objects. I would enter the blazing fire, but not my house with my purpose unfulfilled.” The party had no option but to leave. They, however, left emissaries in disguise to follow Gautam and watch his movements.

For some time he stayed on a mountain near Gaya, and then in his wanderings he fell upon a beautiful village, Uruvila, by the bank of the river Niranjana with clear water, good landing places, with fine trees and thickets and set on all sides with meadows and villages. He was pleased with this specimen of sylvan beauty and decided to make it his abode. (1) From here he appears to have made excursions to other places in quest of

(1) *Lalit vistar*, p. 85 ; See 177 post.

knowledge. He first decided to pay a visit and discuss personally the rival doctrines with their reputed exponents. He had already visited the Brahmins of the orthodox school, whose tenets of securing liberation by the offering of sacrifice and subjecting the body to mortification, he had no difficulty in rejecting as worthy of no serious thought. He next tried to come to grips with the renowned teacher ■ Sankhya Philosophy. Such an one was Arad Kalap, a sage of repute, who was also a religious preceptor to three hundred pupils. He lived in the great kingdom of Vaishali. Gautam appears to have been attracted to this man, because he was reputed to have enjoined poverty and the subjugation of the senses—as distinguished from self-torture and the practice of Yoge. Arad Kalap saw him from afar, and was fascinated by Gautam's tall and stately appearance, so that he exclaimed to his disciples: "Behold: see the noble appearance of that man." And they said: "Truly we see it. It is very marvellous." Gautam went to this Brahmin and said, "I seek to become a Brahmin scholar of Arad Kalap." The latter replied: "Do so, Gautam, according to that teaching of the law by which a devout son of good family may acquire the knowledge with little trouble." One of the pupils brought him, as is the custom, a jug of water for the stranger to drink. He now settled down as a disciple of Arad for the study of his doctrine of life and its problems.

It is not clear how long he stayed with this tutor; but he had little difficulty in mastering his doctrine, and said so to his preceptor, who raised him to the rank equal to his own.

Arad was a dualist and a follower of Sankhya philosophy. He expounded its main doctrine to Gautam: "The evolvent and the evolute; birth, old age and death, know that this has been called the reality by us: egoism, intellect and the unmanifested being—the evolvents, and the external objects—the evolutes, of which the soul possesses the knowledge. That which is born and grows old, is bound and dies—is to be known as the manifested and its contrary ■ the unmanifested. Ego manifests itself by the consciousness of its actions *e.g.*, 'I say,' 'I know,' 'I go.' There can be no effect without a cause.

Knowledge of four things ensures liberation. Knowledge of the illuminated and the unilluminated, the manifested and the unmanifested. The soul that can distinguish these attains to the immortal sphere. Vedic sacrifices are vain." Gautam enquired whether the liberation of the soul implied its absolution from the routine of births and deaths,—to which the seer replied in the negative. He said: "Even though the pure soul is declared to be 'liberated,' yet so long as the soul remains, there can be no absolute abandonment of it." ⁽¹⁾ Gautam was seeking that liberation which would free the soul from the cycle of births and deaths. He was, therefore, not satisfied with the exponent of the Sankhya doctrine of life and, therefore, left his tutor for Magadh, or the country round about Benares and then to Rajgrah, a town near Gaya, where he settled down on the slopes of Pandav mountain.

It will be observed that Kashi or Benares had in Gautam's time already acquired a reputation for its learning, and Gautam, who was out to study, should have naturally drifted southward from his home to the city on the bank of the holy Ganges; but he avoided the maelstrom of a city-life, and chose the more secluded spots of Sanskrit learning. At any rate, spending a year unprofitably elsewhere, he went to Rajgrah kingdom, to which place he had been drawn by the name of Rudrak, who had seven hundred pupils, and whom he wished to see. There he was seen one morning, entering with a begging-bowl and monk's frock "to beg with peace of mind in my forward steps and in my backward steps, in my looks, in the bending and stretching of my body, with peace of mind in the wearing of my coat, begging-bowl and monk's frock, not allowing my senses to become excited, or my mind to contemplate exterior things, as an automaton, as he who carries a cask of oil, seeing no further than the length of a yoke. When the dwellers in Rajgrah saw me, they marvelled." ⁽²⁾

The news of Gautam's arrival was carried to the King. He was told that the new mendicant lived at the foot of the mountain, to which king Bimbeshwar proceeded with his people.

⁽¹⁾ *Buddha Charitra*, 49 S.B.E., 130, 131. ⁽²⁾ *Lalit Victor*, 81.

He saw that Gautam had spread grass upon which he was seated in the contemplative posture, "his legs crossed, immoveable as the Meru."⁽¹⁾ After saluting his feet, the King told him that he had a strong friendship with his father's family, come down by inheritance and that, therefore, he ventured to give him advice. He added: "When I consider thy wide-spread race, beginning with the Sun, thy fresh youth, and thy conspicuous beauty,—whence comes this resolve of thine, so out of all harmony with the rest, set wholly on a mendicant's life, not on a kingdom?"⁽²⁾ "If, therefore, gentle youth, through thy love for thy father thou desirest not thy paternal kingdom in thy generosity—then, at any rate, thy choice must not be excused accepting forthwith one-half of my kingdom."⁽³⁾ He added that if his aim is to attain heavenly bliss, then let him offer sacrifices, as it has been his family's immemorial custom.⁽⁴⁾ Gautam thanked the King for his generous and friendly offer; but, he added that success in pleasure thwarts effort—and "As for the common opinion—pleasures are enjoyments, none of them when examined, is worthy of being enjoyed; fine garments and the rest are only the accessories of things; they are to be regarded as merely the remedies for pain. Water is desired for allaying thirst, food in the same way for removing hunger, a house for keeping off the wind, the heat of the sun and the rain; and dress for keeping off the cold and to cover one's nakedness. External objects, therefore, are to human beings means for remedying pain, not in themselves sources of enjoyment; what wise man would allow that he enjoys those delights, which are only used as remedies? He who, when burned with the heat of bilious fever, maintains that cold appliances are an enjoyment, when he is only engaged in alleviating pain,—he indeed might give the name of enjoyment to pleasures." Then turning to the sacrifice, he added: "And as for what thou saidest, 'be diligent in sacrifices for religion, such as are worthy of thy race, and bring a glorious fruit,'—honour to such sacrifices! I desire not that fruit which is sought by causing pain to others! To kill a

(1) *Meru* is the name of a mountain.

(2) *Buddh Chariṭra*, 49 B.E. p. 107.
§ 23.

(3) *Buddh Chaitra* p. 107, § 25.

(4) *Ib.*, pp. 109, 110, § 29.

helpless victim through a wish for future reward—it would be an unseemly action for a merciful-hearted good man, even if the reward of the sacrifice were eternal ; but what if, after all, it is subject to decay ? And even if true religion did not consist in quite another rule of conduct, by self-restraint, moral practice and a total absence of passion,—still it would not be seemly to follow the rule of sacrifice, where the highest reward is described as attained only by slaughter.”⁽¹⁾ He then added that he was not to be lured into a course of action for future reward, as his mind did not delight in future births. He told the King that he had come to see Rudrak, who proclaimed liberation.

Now, Rudrak was a philosophical Nihilist, because his intellect could not fathom the essence of either spirit or matter. This did not satisfy Gautam, who was looking out for an escape from the tyranny of re-incarnation. He left his hermitage and repaired to the neighbouring town of Gaya, where he fixed his lonely habitation on the bank of Niranjān. Five mendicants came to join him. He had now collected sufficient experience of the different systems of philosophy, but wished to give the orthodox system one more trial.

He decided to practise self-mortification, by fasting and other acts of self-denial. He did so for a long period of six years, but as he was no nearer his goal, he reflected to himself : “ This is not the way, to passionlessness, nor to perfect knowledge, nor to liberation ; that was certainly the true way which I found at the root of the Jambu ⁽²⁾ tree. But that cannot be attained by one who has lost his strength.....wearied with hunger, thirst, and fatigue, with his mind no longer self-possessed through fatigue ; how should one, who is not absolutely calm, reach the end which is to be attained by his mind ? True calm is properly obtained by the constant satisfaction of the senses ; the mind’s self-possession is only obtained by the senses being perfectly satisfied. True meditation is produced in him whose mind is self-possessed and at rest ; to him whose thoughts are engaged

⁽¹⁾ *Buddh Charitra*, 49 S.B.E. pp. 120, 121. ⁽²⁾ “ Rose Apple”.

in meditation, the exercise of perfect contemplation begins at once. By contemplation are obtained those conditions through which is eventually gained that supreme calm, undecaying, immortal state, which is so hard to be realized." (1)

Having decided to resume his wonted life, he took a bath, and from the hands of a fair milk-maid, by name Nandā—daughter of the head herdsman, he drank milk, and then proceeded to the root of a Pipal tree⁽²⁾ the ground of which was carpetted with young grass. There he sat in his sedent posture, exclaiming, "I will not rise from this position on the earth until I have obtained my utmost aim". Mara—the Demon, tried to tempt him, and employed his three sons—Confusion, Gaiety and Pride, and his three daughters,—Lust, Delight and Thirst to seduce him from his purpose. Seduction failing, he tried intimidation and coercion. But the sage withstood their blandishments and repulsed their attacks. And "then by that divine, perfectly pure sight, he beheld the whole world as in a spotless mirror. As he saw the various transmigrations and re-births of the various beings, with their several lower or higher merits from their actions, compassion grew up more with him. These living beings, under the influence of evil actions, pass into wretched worlds—those others, under the influence of good actions, go forward in heaven. If man only knew that such was the consequence of selfishness, he would always give to others even pieces of his own body". He then reflected that men's minds are ruled by desire—the desire to live. Desire arises where there is sensation, and sensation is produced by contact, and contact arises through the six organs of the senses, and these arise in the organism, where there is incipient consciousness, which arises from later impressions left by former actions, which again arise from ignorance; and inversely, beginning from ignorance follows the same sequence. "Thus ignorance is declared to be the root of the great trunk of pain by all the wise; therefore, it is to be stopped by those who seek liberation".

(1) *Buddha Charitra*, 49 S.B.E. 134.

"Asvattha tree."

(2) "*Ficus religiosa*", in *Pali*—

"Thus he, the holy one, sitting there, on his seat of grass at the root of the tree, pondering, by his own efforts, attained at last perfect knowledge."⁽¹⁾ "Then the Buddha, mounted on a throne, up in the air to the height of seven palm-trees, addressed all those Nrinitt Bodhisatvs, illumining their minds: 'Ho! Ho! listen ye to the words of me, who have now attained perfect knowledge; everything is achieved by meritorious works; therefore, as long as existence lasts, acquire merit'".⁽²⁾ And then he spake these words, which were the first he uttered at the moment of his attaining Buddhhood:—"Looking for the maker of this tabernacle, I have run through a course of many births, not finding him; and painful is birth again and again. But now, maker of the tabernacle, thou hast been seen; thou shalt not make up this tabernacle again. All thy rafters are broken, thy ridge-pole is sundered; the mind, approaching the eternal, has attained to the extinction of all desires."⁽³⁾

This was his Enlightenment.—Let us pause to consider how this enlightenment came, which shaped the course of all his future career. Buddha had left the easy life of the palace to seek salvation for human suffering. He had been to the most accredited teachers of his religion. Like them he had led a life of severest austerity, passed it in fasting and penance and the practice of Yoge, which, it was believed, would open the pores of the human mind to receive revelation. It did not come. His six years had been spent in a vain pursuit for direct knowledge. But by a sudden flash of his mind, while seated under a pipal tree, he received by inspiration what had been denied to him by revelation. He saw the whole chart of life before him;—why it arose, and why it ended, and what was the root-cause of human suffering: It was desire which was rooted in selfishness and its salve was a life of self-denial. That was all he then learnt, and that was all he ever strove to teach. The truth he had learnt was an elementary truth, a truth which,

(1) *Buddha Charitra*, 49 S.B.E., p. 155. of a similar renunciation in his past life II

(2) *Ib.*, p. 155. *Jatak (Camb.)* No. 181; p. 60—63. *Ib.*, VI


(3) *Dhammapad*, XI—153, 154; 10 *(Camb.)* No. 538/539; pp. 1—37. S.B.E. p. 42. The Master recounted his story

a little attention to human psychology, might have taught him even in his own palace. But the great truth which he could not have then learnt, and learnt only by experience,—was the vanity of human assumption that mental abstraction brings the soul in direct contact with the eternal Soul, and opens the gate-way to omniscience. That was a disillusionment which accompanied the enlightenment. It taught him another psychological fact, *viz.*, that knowledge cannot be acquired by the mere exercise of the will, and that it required the exercise of the mind. It decided him to teach the Golden Rule of taking a middle course in life—the middle path between sacrifice and sensuality. Sacrifices and penance did not bring divine wisdom; sensuality pushed it further remote. The ideal life was the life which, while abandoning the form and ceremonial of the conventional creed, operated on the mind, and cleansed it of the cob-webs of priestly indoctrinated belief—that no effort of the mind was necessary to attain to the height of true wisdom, and that the life—that is and is to be—could be ennobled by burnt sacrifices and self-immolation, or that indulgence in the sensuous pleasures was conducive to its real or final happiness. The enlightenment gave him the grip of the real cause of human sorrow, and the middle path suggested its remedy. These two facts became the main pivot of his teaching. They still remain the cardinal points of his doctrine.

The tree under which Gantam became “the Buddh”, or, the Enlightened One, has become known to history as the Mahabodhi (¹) tree or the tree of great knowledge.

After discovering the key to salvation, Buddh sat cross-legged on the ground under the Bodhi tree, for seven days absorbed in meditation and enjoying the bliss of enlightenment. “Thus passed that period of seven days which is designated the ‘ailment of joy.’”(²) During this week he is stated to have formulated the law of causation which he stated in ■ sorites : “From ignorance comes the combination of formations

(1) Sk. *Maha-great, Bodh-wisdom* ; also “Bo-tree”
called “Bodhi tree” and shortened into (2) 49 S.B.E. p. 159.



(4) Buddh Gaya, General view of the Great Temple.

of tendencies ; (1) from such formations comes consciousness ; (2) from consciousness, individual being ; (3) from individual being, the six organs of senses ; from the six organs, contact ; from contact, sensation ; (4) from sensation, desire ; (5) from desire, clinging to life ; (6) from clinging to life, continuity of becoming ; (7) from continuity of becoming, birth, from birth, decay and death ; from decay and death, suffering :

And inversely, in the following catechism :—

Q. What is the cause of misery and suffering ?

A. Old age and death.

Q. What is the cause of old age and death ?

A. Birth.

Q. Of Birth ?

A. Continuity of becoming.

Q. Of continuity of becoming ?

A. Clinging to life.

Q. Of clinging to life ?

A. Desire.

Q. Of desire ?

A. Sensation or perception.

Q. Of Sensation ?

A. Contact with the object of senses.

Q. Of contact with objects ?

A. The organs of sense.

Q. Of the organs ?

A. Name and form of individual being.

Q. Of name and form ?

A. Consciousness.

Q. Of consciousness ?

A. Combination of formations of tendencies i.e. proclivities and individual tendencies or character derived from previous births.

Q. Of such formations ?

A. Ignorance.

(1) Sk. *Samskar* संस्कार, Pali *Sankhara*, see Gloss.

(2) Sk. *Gyan*—Consciousness—Knowledge.

(3) Sk. *Namrup*—"Name, and form".

(4) Sk. *Vedana*—feeling.

(5) Sk. *Prishna* : lust, thirst, desire.

(6) Sk. "*Upadan*".

(7) Sk. *Bhav*.

It will be seen that this chain of causation has already been set out before. It has been again repeated here because it occupies an important place in the Buddhist doctrine and is abridged in its creed, found carved on Buddhist edicts: "Conditions (or laws) of existence which proceed from a cause, the cause of these hath the Buddha explained, as also the cessation of them. Of such Truths is the Great Shraman the Teacher."

Next he meditated for another seven days under a banyan tree. It is there that a Brahman put him the question "Who is a true Brahman?" And the answer given was: "One free from evil and pride; self-restrained, learned and pure."

Then he meditated for another seven days under another tree; and it was then that a heavy storm was raised to distract his thoughts; but the serpent—Musalind, protected him by coiling himself round him, and he spread his hood over his head to shelter him from the rain. The storm raged for seven days, during which the King of serpents remained coiled, and the ascetic unmoved. When the storm ended, Buddha exclaimed: "Happy is the seclusion of the satisfied man, who has learnt and seen the truth."

Yet another week was passed under the tree *Rajratna*.

These represent the four "Dhyans" or meditations symbolizing the four stages of progress in the path to knowledge. These Dhyans are nothing more than the Hindu Yoge⁽¹⁾ already discussed.

The secret that Buddha had obtained,—the treasure that he had sought and found—is the key to Nirvan which must be left to be set out in the sequel.

For the present, we are here concerned only with the broad incidents of his monastic life. Buddha was now 36.

(1) Sk. *Yuj* (युज्) to join. The joining of human soul with the Divine spirit brought about by intense concentration:

See *Rig Veda* III—62, 10; *Manu* VI—62. *Bhagvat Gita*, VI—11-12.

CHAPTER VI

FROM BUDDHHOOD TO RETURN HOME.

Twelve years of Ministry.

Gautam had now found the object of his quest. This "became known to the denizens of Heaven and to the Evil Powers below." The former had been throughout encouraging and helping him in his mission. The latter were active in thwarting his plan. But the power of Good at last having triumphed over the power of Evil, the latter still strove to strike a bargain with the Victor. That was a time when Buddh's mind was wavering whether he should keep his great discovery to himself or proclaim it to the world. During his four weeks of fasting and cogitation, he had made one fact clear to himself,—that he had discovered the true path. But should he tread it alone?—he had not decided. The Mahavagga thus describes his mental attitude:—

"Then in the mind of the Blessed One, who was alone, and had retired into solitude, the following thought arose: 'I have penetrated this doctrine which is profound, difficult to perceive and to understand, which brings quietude of heart, which is exalted, which is unattainable by reasoning, abstruse, intelligible (only) to the wise. These people, on the other hand, are given to desire, intent upon desire, delighting in desire. To these people, therefore, who are given to desire, intent upon desire, delighting in desire, the law of causality and the chain of causation will be a matter difficult to understand; most difficult for them to understand will be also the extinction of all *samskars*, the getting rid of all the sub-strata of existence, the destruction of desire, the absence of passion, quietude of heart, Nirvan. Now if I proclaim the doctrine, and other men are not able to understand my preaching, there would result but weariness and annoyance to me.'

“ And then the following.....stanzas, unheard before, occurred to the Blessed One : ‘ With great pains have I acquired it. Enough ! Why should I now proclaim it ? This doctrine will not be easy to understand to beings that are lost in lust and hatred.’

‘ Given to lust, surrounded with thick darkness, they will not see what is repugnant (to their minds), abstruse, profound, difficult to perceive and subtle.’

“ When the Blessed One pondered over this matter, his mind became inclined to remain in quiet and not to preach the doctrine. Then Brahm Sahampati, understanding by the power of his mind the reflection which had arisen in the mind of the Blessed One, thought : ‘ Alas ! the world perishes ! Alas ! the world is destroyed ! if the mind of the Fathagat, of the holy, of the absolute Sambuddh, inclines itself to remain in quiet, and not to preach the doctrine.’

“ Then Brahm Sahampati disappeared from Brahm’s world, and appeared before the Blessed One (as quickly) as a strong man might stretch his bent arm out, or draw back his out-stretched arm.

“ And Brahm Sahampati adjusted his upper robe so as to cover one shoulder, and putting his right knee on the ground, raised his joined hands towards the Blessed One, and said to the Blessed One : ‘ Lord, may the Blessed One preach the doctrine ! may the Perfect One preach the doctrine ! there are beings whose mental eyes are darkened by scarcely any dust ; but if they do not hear the doctrine, they cannot attain salvation. These will understand the doctrine.’

“ Thus spoke Brahm Sahampati ; and when he had thus spoken, he further said : ‘ The Dhamm hitherto manifested in the country of Magadh has been impure, thought out by contaminated men. But do thou now open the door of the Immortal, let them hear the doctrine discovered by the Spotless One.’

“ ‘ As a man standing on a rock, on mountain’s top, might overlook the people all around, thus, O wise One,

ascending to the highest palace of Truth, look down, All-seeing One, upon the people lost in suffering, overcome by birth and decay,—thou, who has freed thyself from suffering.’

“ ‘Arise, O hero, O victorious One! Wander through the world, O leader of the pilgrim band, who thyself art free from doubt. May the Blessed One preach the doctrine! there will be people who can understand it.’

“ ‘When he had spoken thus, the Blessed One said to Brahm Sahampati: The following thought, Brahm, has occurred to me: ‘I have penetrated this doctrine..... When I pondered over this matter, Brahm, my mind became inclined to remain in quiet, and not to preach the doctrine.’

“ And a second time Brahm Sahampati said to the Blessed One: ‘Lord, may the Blessed One preach the doctrine!’ And for the second time the Blessed One said *as before* to Brahm Sahampati:

“ And a third time Brahm Sahampati said to the Blessed One: ‘Lord, may the Blessed One preach the doctrine!’

“ Then the Blessed One, when he had heard Brahm’s solicitation, looked, full of compassion towards sentient beings, over the world, with his (all-perceiving) eye of a Buddh. And the Blessed One, looking over the world with his eye of a Buddh, saw beings, whose mental eyes were darkened by scarcely any dust, and beings whose eyes were covered by much dust, beings sharp of sense, and blunt of sense, of good disposition and of bad disposition, easy to instruct and difficult to instruct, some of them seeing the dangers of future life and of sin.

“ As, in a pond of blue lotuses, or water-roses, or white lotuses, some blue lotuses, or water-roses, or white lotuses, born in the water, grown up in the water, do not emerge over the water, but thrive hidden under the water; and other blue lotuses, or water-roses, or white lotuses, born in the water, grown up in the water, reach to the surface of the water; and other blue lotuses, or water-roses, or white lotuses, born in the water, grown up in the water, stand emerging out of the water, and the water does not touch them.

"Thus, the Blessed One, looking over the world with his eye of a **Buddh** saw beings whose mental eyes were darkened.....and when he had thus seen them, he addressed **Brahm Sahampati** in the following stanza: 'Wide opened is the door of the Immortal to all who have ears to hear; let them send forth faith to meet it. The **Ādhamm** sweet and good I spake not, **Brahm!** despairing of the weary task, to men.

"Then **Brahm Sahampati** understood: 'The Blessed One grants my request that He should preach the doctrine.' And he bowed down before the Blessed One, and passed round him with his right side toward him; and then he straightway disappeared."⁽¹⁾

But still this was the psychological moment of doubt when **Mar** appeared upon the scene, and this is how the Master himself described it to his favourite disciple—**Anand**: "Then came," he said, "**Mar**, the wicked one, unto me—coming up to me, he placed himself at my side; standing at my side, **Anand**, **Mar**—the wicked one, spoke unto me, saying: 'Enter now into Nirvan, Exalted One, enter Nirvan, Perfect One: now is the time of Nirvan arrived for the Exalted One!, As he thus spoke, I replied, **Anand**, to **Mar**,—the wicked one, saying, 'I shall not enter Nirvan, thou wicked one, until I shall have gathered monks as my disciples, who are wise and instructed, intelligent hearers of the word, acquainted with the Doctrine, experts in the Doctrine, and the Second Doctrine, versed in the Ordinances, walking in the Law, to propagate, teach, promulgate, explain, formulate, analyse, what they have heard from the Master, to annihilate and exterminate by their knowledge any heresy which arises, and preach the Doctrine with wonder-working. I shall not enter Nirvan, thou wicked one, until I shall have gained nuns as my disciples, who are both wise and instructed. I shall not enter Nirvan, thou wicked one, until the life of holiness which I point out, has been successful, grown in favour, and extended among all mankind, and is in vogue

(1) *Mahavagga* 1-5-2 et. seq; 13 S.B.E. 84—88.

and thoroughly made known to all men."

But all this was *post facto*—what he had then decided was to disseminate his views and enlist disciples. He felt that the strength within him justified the course he was taking and fortunately, (the legend recites through the inspiration of a deity) two merchants—Tapisya and Bhalika⁽¹⁾—came his way and offered him food in a bowl—the only vessel in which he would partake of refreshments—which he took after his long spell of fasting. "But the merchants, Tapisya and Bhalika, when they saw that the Exalted One, when his repast was over, had washed his bowl and his hands, bowed their heads to the feet of the Exalted One, and spake to the Exalted One, saying, 'We who are here, O Sire! take refuge in the Exalted one and in His Doctrine; may the Exalted One accept us as His adherents from this day forward throughout our lives, we who have taken our refuge in Him.'"

But these were his lay-followers, not disciples. He now cast about for the latter. His thoughts first turned to his first two teachers to whom he had gone to learn, and whom he now wished to teach. But they were both dead. There remained the first disciples who had deserted him. They were staying in the holy city of Benares, and thither he went by slow stages, preaching and making converts as he proceeded from village to village. In some he was given a public ovation; and when he arrived at the city of Savatthi, the citizens volunteered to be charioteers in his service⁽²⁾. Thence he came to the Ganges, and he bade the ferryman cross. "Good man," he said, "convey me across the Ganges, may the seven blessings be thine." But the ferryman demanded the toll. "I carry none across unless he pays the fee"—to which Buddh replied. "I have nothing, what shall I give?" and the legend records that he flew across through the sky like the king of birds; which disguises the fact that some one paid for him. However, the fact became known to King Bimbeshwar who promptly abolished the toll for all

(1) Sk. "Tapisya"—"Penance" or "devotion." The correct word for (2) *Buddh Charitra* XV—98; 49 S.E.E.
"Bhalika" cannot be guessed.

ascetics⁽¹⁾. His first visit to Benares is thus described in the Mahavagga⁽²⁾ which is almost the only record of this portion of his life.

"And the Blessed One, wandering from place to place, came to Benares, to the Deer park Isipatan (now Sarnath,) to the place where the five Bhikkhus were. And the five Bhikkhus saw the Blessed One coming from afar; when they saw him, they concerted with each other, saying, 'Friends, there come the Saman Gautam, who lives in abundance, who has given up his exertions, and who has turned to an abundant life. Let us not salute him; not rise from our seats when he approaches; nor take his bowl and his robe from his hands. But let us put there a seat; if he likes, let him sit down'.

"But when the Blessed One gradually approached near unto those five Bhikkhus, the five Bhikkhus kept not their agreement. They went forth to meet the Blessed One; one took his bowl and his robe, another prepared a seat, a third one brought water for the washing of the feet, a foot-stool, and a towel. Then the Blessed One sat down on the seat they had prepared; and when he was seated, the Blessed One washed his feet. Now they addressed the Blessed One by his name, and with the appellation 'Friend.'


"When they spoke to him thus, the Blessed One said to the five Bhikkhus: 'Do not address, O Bhikkhus, the Fathagat by his name, and with the appellation "Friend." The Fathagat, O Bhikkhus, is the holy, absolute Sambuddh. Give ear, O Bhikkhus! The immortal (Amrat) has been won (by me); I will teach you; to you I preach the doctrine. If you walk in the way I show you, you will, ere long, have penetrated to the truth, having yourselves known it and seen it face to face; and you will live in the possession of that highest goal of the holy life, for the sake of which noble youths fully give up the world and go forth into the houseless state.

"When he had spoken thus, the five monks said to the Blessed One: 'By those observances, Friend Gautam, by

(1) *Buddh Charitra* XV—100; 49 S.B.E. 170.

(2) *Mahavagga* 1-6-10 et seq. This is

corroborated by a summarized account in the *Buddh Charitra* XV, 101-119; 49 S.B.E. 170—173.



(5) Sarnath, Stone Statue of Buddha seated cross-legged.

those practices, by those austerities, you have not been able to obtain power surpassing that of men, nor the superiority of full and holy knowledge and insight. How will you now, living in abundance, having given up your exertions, having turned to an abundant life, be able to obtain power surpassing that of men, and the superiority of full and holy knowledge and insight ?

"When they had spoken thus, the Blessed One said to the five Bhikkhus: 'The Tathagat, O Bhikkhus, does not live in abundance, he has not given up exertion, he has not turned to an abundant life. The Tathagat is, O Bhikkhus, the holy, absolute Sambuddh. Give ear, O Bhikkhus; the immortal has been won (by me); I will teach you, to you I will preach the doctrine. If you walk in the way I show you, you will, ere long, have penetrated to the truth, having yourselves known it and seen it face to face; and you will live in the possession of that highest goal of the holy life, for the sake of which noble youths fully give up the world and go forth into the houseless state.'

"And the five Bhikkhus said to the Blessed One a second time (*as above*). And the Blessed One said to the five Bhikkhus a second time (*as above*). And the five Bhikkhus said to the Blessed One a third time (*as above*).

"When they had spoken thus, the Blessed One said to the five Bhikkhus: 'Do you admit, O Bhikkhus, that I have never spoken to you in this way before this day?'

" 'You have never spoken so, Lord.'

"The Tathagat, O Bhikkhus, is the holy absolute Sambuddh. Give ear, O Bhikkhus," (*etc. as above*).

"And the Blessed One was able to convince the five Bhikkhus; and the five Bhikkhus again listened willingly to the Blessed One; they gave ear and fixed their mind on the knowledge (which the Buddh imparted to them).

"And the Blessed One thus addressed the five Bhikkhus: 'There are two extremes, O Bhikkhus, which he, who has given up the world, ought to avoid. What are these two

extremes? A life given to pleasures, devoted to pleasures and lusts: this is degrading, sensual, vulgar, ignoble, and profitless; and a life given to mortifications: this is painful, ignoble, and profitless. By avoiding these two extremes, O Bhikkhus, the Tathagat has gained the knowledge of the Middle Path which leads to insight, which leads to wisdom, which conduces to calm, to knowledge, to the Sambodhi, to Nirvan'.

“ ‘ Which, O Bhikkhus, is this Middle Path, the knowledge of which the Tathagat has gained, which leads to insight, which leads to wisdom, which conduces to calm, to knowledge, to the Sambodhi, to Nirvan? It is the holy eight-fold Path, namely, Right Belief, Right Aspiration, Right Speech, Right Conduct, Right Means of Livelihood, Right Endeavour, Right Memory, Right Meditation. This, O Bhikkhus, is the Middle Path, the knowledge of which the Tathagat has gained, which leads to insight, which leads to wisdom, which conduces to calm, to knowledge, to the Sambodhi, to Nirvan'.

“ ‘ This, O Bhikkhus, ■ the Noble Truth of Suffering: birth is suffering; decay is suffering; illness is suffering; death is suffering. Presence of objects we hate, is suffering; separation from objects we love, is suffering; not to obtain what we desire, is suffering. Briefly the five-fold clinging to existence ■ suffering.

“ ‘ This, O Bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth of the Cause of suffering: Thirst, that leads to re-birth, accompanied by pleasure and lust, finding its delight here and there. (This thirst is threefold),—namely, thirst for pleasure, thirst for existence, thirst for prosperity.'

“ ‘ This, O Bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth of the cessation of suffering: (it ceases with) the complete cessation of this thirst,—a cessation which consists in the absence of every passion, with the abandoning of this thirst, with the doing away with it, with the deliverance from it, with the destruction of desire.'

“ ‘ This, O Bhikkhus, is the Noble Truth of the Path which leads to the cessation of suffering : that holy eight-fold Path, that is to say, Right Belief, Right Aspiration, Right Speech, Right Conduct, Right Means of Livelihood, Right Endeavour, Right Memory, Right Meditation.

“ ‘ This is the Noble Truth of suffering ; thus, O Bhikkhus, of this doctrine, which formerly had not been heard of, have I obtained insight, knowledge, understanding, wisdom, intuition. This Noble Truth of suffering must be understood ; thus, O Bhikkhus, of this doctrine.....(*&c. down to 'intuition'*). This Noble Truth of Suffering I have understood ; thus, O Bhikkhus, of this doctrine,.....(*&c. down to 'intuition'*).

“ ‘ This is the Noble Truth of the Cause of suffering ; thus, O Bhikkhus, (*&c.*). This Noble Truth of the Cause of suffering, must be abandoned.....has been abandoned by me ; thus, O Bhikkhus, (*&c.*).’

“ ‘ This is the Noble Truth of the Cessation of suffering ; thus, O Bhikkhus, (*&c.*). This Noble Truth of the Cessation of suffering must be seen face to face...has been seen by me face to face ; thus, O Bhikkhus, (*&c.*).

“ ‘ This is the Noble Truth of the Path which leads to the cessation of suffering ; thus, O Bhikkhus, (*&c.*). This Noble Truth of the Path which leads to the cessation of suffering, must be realised...has been realised by me ; thus O Bhikkhus,

“ ‘ As long, O Bhikkhus, as I did not possess with perfect purity this true knowledge and insight into these four Noble Truths, with its three modifications and its twelve constituent parts, so long O Bhikkhus, I knew that I had not yet obtained the highest absolute Sambodhi in the world of men and gods, in Mar's and Brahm's world, among all beings, Samans and Brahmans, gods and men.

“ ‘ But since I possessed, O Bhikkhus, with perfect purity this true knowledge and insight into these four Noble Truths, with its three modifications, and its twelve constituent parts,

then I knew, O Bhikkhus, that I had obtained the highest universal Sambodhi in the world of men and gods.

"And this knowledge and insight arose in my mind. 'The emancipation of my mind cannot be lost; this is my last birth; hence I shall not be born again.'

"Thus the Blessed One spoke. The five Bhikkhus were delighted, and they rejoiced at the words of the Blessed One⁽¹⁾."

The five quondam disciples of his were so impressed by his sermon, that all of them, headed by Kondanna⁽²⁾, begged to be admitted in his Order, and they were so admitted with these words: "Come near, O Monks, well-preached in the Doctrine, walk in purity to make an end to all suffering." These were his first disciples,—they and he were the first members of his Order.

But their number soon grew. Buddha himself followed the advice he gave to his disciples: "O disciples," he said, "I am loosed from all bonds, divine and human; ye also, O disciples, are loosed from all bonds, divine and human. Go ye out, O disciples, and travel from place to place for the welfare of many people, for the joy of many people, in pity for the world, for the blessing, welfare and joy of gods and men. Go not in one way to one place. Preach, O disciples, the law, the beginning of which is noble, in spirit and in letter; preach the whole and full, pure of holiness. There are beings, who are pure from the dust of the earthly, but if they hear not the gospel of the law, they perish: they shall understand the law. But I, O disciples, go to Uruvela, to the village of the general, to preach the law." Before doing so, he had made some more converts in Benares, amongst whom was Yash,⁽³⁾ (Yasa) scion of a wealthy house at Benares. His parents followed the example of their son and on his death, his widow did the same. Yash not only became himself a convert, but by his exertion and influence got many to join the

(1) *Mahavagga* 1-6-10-29 13 S.B.E.
91-97.

(2) Lit = "The Knower."
(3) Sk.

brotherhood whose number soon rose to sixty. Men and women flocked to listen to his lectures. They were entranced and whether from curiosity or conviction, Brahmans, and non-Brahmans, men and women were admitted into the brotherhood. For instance, here at Benares he had converted no less than thirty Brahmans, officiating priests, to his faith, and from the other rung of the ladder, robbers⁽¹⁾ and harlots. One such harlot by name Kasikal with her two sons joined the order at Benares itself⁽²⁾. But this is not all. Men and women flocked to him from distant parts: a woman ascetic from Mathura named Trikavyamgika, a Brahman named Vidyakar and his son—Sabhya, residing at Shvetbalark, travelled up to the Deer Park to receive their baptism. Of these Sabhya became distinguished as a preacher of the new gospel.⁽³⁾ A number of Brahman and other ascetics, residing in the Vindhya, similarly succumbed to his spell. The new gospel had taken root in Benares. He charged his disciples to be true to the faith and to preach it to the surrounding world.

Buddh sent them out in all directions to make more converts, while he reserved an area for his own visit. He went from village to village, staying a night at each and making converts. His attractive personality and his persuasive speech, coupled with the fact that he was a hermit-prince, brought to him a crowd of followers, who were promised eternal bliss in return for nothing but the ordinary courtesies which were purely voluntary. "Whoever, Sirs, hears, sees, and welcomes with joy this methodical arrangement of the law, which is a mine of happiness and prosperity, and honours it with folded hands, shall attain pre-eminent strength with a glorious form and limbs, and a retinue of the holy, and an intelligence of the highest reach, and the happiness of perfect contemplation, with a deep calm of uninterrupted bliss, with his senses in their highest perfection, and illuminated by unclouded knowledge. He shall assuredly attain these eight pre-eminent per-

(1) *Buddh Charitra* XVII—16; 49
S.B.E. p. 195.

(2) *Ib.* XVII—2; 49 S.B.E. 190.

(3) *Ib.* XVII—4; 49 S.B.E. 191.

fections, who hears and sees this law with a serene soul and worships it with folded hands. Whoever in the midst of the assembly shall gladly offer a pulpit to the high-minded teacher of the great law, that virtuous man shall assuredly attain the seat of the most excellent, and also the seat of a house-holder and the throne of a universal monarch" ⁽¹⁾. And much to the same effect. It was sufficient to drive the rustics to the ranks of the Order.

Hinduism was then unorganized, its forces were weak and scattered. It is true, its most outstanding feature—the caste, had seized hold of the people; but its hold was weak; and it was rendered weaker by the Buddhistic onslaught. For Buddha did not recognize caste. He made his converts from all castes, as he drew them from all classes. So when the Brahmins questioned him about caste, he said: "Do not ask about descent, but ask about conduct; from wood, is true fire born; likewise from man, although belonging to a low family, many become noble, when restrained from sinning by humility" ⁽²⁾. Such was the case at Uruvela, where there lived a thousand Brahmin Sadhus, who kept alive the sacred fire of sacrifice according to the Vedic rites and performed their ablutions in the river Niranjana.⁽³⁾ He met similar success elsewhere. At Uruvela he converted the daughters of Nandik Sujat and others. It appears that in his first mission he made a large number of Brahmin converts;—those who were versed in the Vedas and those who were regarded as the hierophants of their faiths—priests and high priests, with all their families, men and women—accepted his creed.⁽⁴⁾ He visited his previous haunts, where he had tarried for knowledge. He now returned to impart it. At Rajgrah he had been to Udrak's monastery. He had 700 disciples and they all accepted the faith and received their staves and bowls from the hands of Buddha. There he stayed for two years preaching and converting and consolidating the ground won.

(1) *Buddh Charitra* XVI—87—92; 49 S.B.E. p. 184, 185.

(2) *Mahavagga* IV—9; 10 S.B.E. p. 75.

(3) *Buddh Charitra* XVII—8; 49 S.B.E. p. 192.

(4) *Ib.* XVII—10-12; ■ S.B.E. 193.

Here he is said to have performed miracles, offering wealth to those who needed it, curing the halt, the lame, the insane and the blind⁽¹⁾ and healing the sick,⁽²⁾ and solving many doubts. Thus he was asked by his young disciple—Magh, what was the use of riches. To which Gautam replied, "Charity." Then he was asked whether his disciples should offer oblations to their deceased ancestors, to which the Perfect One replied that they had no ancestors after they had taken the vow. Then he was asked—"Is a Brahman born or made—whether he acquires his caste by birth or by deed?" Gautam pointed out that as the grass differs from the tree, worms and moths from the four-footed animals, fish from birds, so, there are no distinctive features in a Brahman and a non-Brahman. Caste, he said, was occupational. For whoever amongst men lives by cow-keeping.....he is a husbandman, not a Brahman... ..and whoever amongst men lives by trade.....he is a merchant...and whoever amongst men lives by serving is a servant, not a Brahman, so I do not call one a Brahman on account of his birth or of his origin from a particular mother.....but the one who is possessed of nothing and seizes upon nothing, him I call a Brahman : whosoever, after cutting all bonds, does not tremble, has taken off all ties and is liberated, him I call a Brahmanthe man who has a profound understanding, who is wise, who knows the true way and the wrong way, who has attained the highest good—him I call a Brahman.....The man who is not hostile amongst the hostile, who is peaceful amongst the violent, not seizing upon anything amongst those that seize upon everything,—him I call a Brahman..... The man who is undaunted like a bull, who is eminent, a hero, a great sage, victorious, free from desire, purified, enlightened—him I call a Brahman"⁽³⁾ He then added that caste is only by common consent, and birth cannot make one a Brahman any more than a non-Brahman. It is by work and merit, by his wisdom, piety and self-sacrifice, that one becomes a Brahman.

(1) *Buddh Charitra* XVII—25; 49 S.B.E. 198.

(2) *Ib.* XVII—15; 49 S.B.E. 194.

(3) The text gives only an abstracted quotation from the long sermon : *Mahavagga* IX—163; 10 S.B.E. p. 107—110.

In one of his wanderings he fell upon a nest of five hundred robbers to whom he preached and at whose hands he ate. They were all reclaimed and converted, and exchanged their tools of burglary for the bowls and staves of piety⁽¹⁾.

In this way Buddha spent twelve years of his ministry, preaching and converting. His missionaries became now scattered in all directions. For eight or nine dry months of the year he and they wandered about, following a settled plan which the assembled brotherhood in the monsoon discussed every year. In India this has been the usual plan of business since time immemorial. All business begins in October and ends in June, the intervening months being spent within the bosom of one's family, in feasting and fasting, rest and recuperation. It is not only the ascetic, but the merchant and the thief that has to bow to the inevitable. So the old Maratha freebooters, who extended their pillaging campaign to the heart of Bengal, knew how impossible it was to ford the rivulets, which swell into surging torrents during the rains; the roads, none too well paved in the dry weather, become one long stream of slush and quagmire, the mountains are impassable, as the rank vegetation, that comes up almost with the first fall of rain, obliterates all traces of the foot-path. The mango-groves, under which travellers bivouac for the night, are converted into shallow cesspools. The villages are likewise immersed in wet and damp and the village rest-houses are closed down; because, uninhabitable as they are in fair weather, they become death-traps in the rains. Better roads and the invention of Railways have altered many of the old habits of the people; but this habit remains; because the old inconveniences may have become ameliorated—but they have not disappeared.

Life of the Buddhist monks followed then this annual routine. In fair weather the brethren joined in batches their appointed circuits. But with the advent of June or July⁽²⁾ they all met at their Monsoon camp fixed in the vicinity of a

(1) *Mahavagga*. XVII—16; 49 S.B.E. ■ 195.

(2) This retreat lasted 3 or 4 months—the longer began from the full moon ■ Asharh (June) and the shorter one from the full moon ■ Shravan; both ending with


the full moon of Kartik, *M.V.* III—8; 135 S.B.E. 300; Hiung Tsiang says that this period was three months from the first of Shravan to the first of Kartik—*Records* II—492.

town or under the hospitable roof of a brother-devotee. During the rains Buddh held daily classes. He imparted knowledge and answered questions. The monks, on the other hand, gave an account of their evangelizing mission, introduced rich converts or those who sought conversion at the hands of the Master, learnt their lessons and prepared for the next itinerary. The monsoon camp of Buddh (called the *Vassa*)⁽¹⁾ was thus a busy hive thronged by worshippers, earnest inquirers and listeners to the daily discourses. These camps were always fixed in a place of some delightful sylvan solitude, on a river-bank and on a mountain-top in the midst of *Sal* forest, where the monks built temporary hermitages for their shelter and out of which they worked according to the strictest routine.

Once, on his way to Rajgrah, Buddh stopped at Gaya, where resided a family who were pillars of Brahman orthodoxy. They belonged to the family of Kashyap (Kassapa) who maintained a large monastery called Uruvil,⁽²⁾ and had under them a thousand pupils trained in the Vedic rites. They kept alive the sacred fire of sacrifice and bathed in the river Niranjani (Neranjana). Their head-priest, Kashyap—was a very *Kuver* for wealth; he was equally firm in his faith. Buddh tried to reason with him, but in vain, and he is said to have resorted to miracles. There lived in Kashyap's sacrificial chamber the King of serpents whom he tamed by his occult power. The high-priest was surprised, but yet not convinced till a shower of miracles brought Kashyap to his senses. Buddh took his abode in the forest near Kashyap's hermitage. He delivered a series of discourses which even gods attended to hear. They shone like flaming lights all night. Kashyap was moved, but yet hesitated to acknowledge Buddh who reflected: "This simpleton will long continue thinking; the great Saman is very powerful and mighty, but he is not holy as I am. So then I shall work on this hermit's heart." He then told Kashyap, "Thou art not holy, Kashyap, nor hast thou found the

(1) Sk. *Varshik*, also *Vassa Panayik*, (2) *Budda Charitra* XVII—8: 46
Sk. *Varshopanayik*—*Divya Valana* 18: S.B.E. 192.
Mahavastu § 286.

path of holiness; and thou knowest nothing of the way by which thou canst be holy and mayest reach the path of holiness." Kashyap reflected and yielded and addressing the Exalted One spake: "Grant me, O Sire, to receive the degrees of initiation, the lower and the higher." Thus Kashyap and his disciples joined the Order, and Kashyap, the chief of ascetics, became the foremost of the Arhats⁽¹⁾. This led to the wholesale conversion of Kashyap's other relations and their pupils. Henceforward Buddh's progression from village to village was a triumphal march and converts came to him, not in hundreds but in thousands. The legends on this point are numerous, though extremely monotonous; but they disclose that Buddh had gained a firm foothold in Benares, Gaya and its purlieus. He now proceeded to visit Rajgrah, the capital of Magadh. Here in the capital of his family-friend, King Bimbeshwar (Bimbisara), Buddh had his most notable converts. He entered the city, attended by his retinue of monks, who had by this time become quite numerous. Some three to five hundred of them formed his escort. He was accompanied by the famous divine Kashyap (Kassapa) whom he had converted at Uruvela. As usual, he entered the city at the head of his monks, and fixed his camp in the bamboo-grove outside the town. When Bimbeshwar heard of it, he took with him a large following of Brahmans and citizens, exaggerated in the text to "twelve myriads." He had heard of the exploits of his old friend at Benares and elsewhere. On this occasion, Buddh and Kashyap sat side by side and the people, when they saw them, did not know who was the Master and who the pupil. Kashyap promptly solved their dilemma by rising from his seat, laying his head at Buddh's feet and repeating these words: "Sire! My Master is the Exalted One: I am his pupil." Buddh then addressed a sermon to the King and his retinue, who were deeply moved, and of whom, the King and several of his retainers immediately became lay converts to Buddhism and the King remained one of his truest friends and patrons.



(6) Sculpture Depicting Buddha's reception by the Sakyas.

The King's example was followed by his numerous subjects including two notable men, by name Sariputra (Sariputta) and Mogaman, who attained to great distinction in the Buddhistic Church. These conversions alarmed the populace, who thought that 'if the whole of Magadh were to turn ascetic, what would become of their country?'—They complained : "The ascetic Gautam is come to bring childlessness: the ascetic Gautam is come to bring subversion of families. Already hath he turned the thousand hermits into his disciples, and he hath made the two hundred and fifty mendicant-disciples of Sanjat his disciples, and now these many distinguished and noble youths of the Magadh kingdom are betaking themselves to the ascetic Gautam to lead a religious life."

That this apprehension was not wholly unjustifiable will be seen from the fact that King Bimbeshwar had taken up the cause of Buddhism in real earnest. He had issued instruction to his eighty thousand village head-men on the tenets of his faith and then sent them to Buddha to receive further instructions. His disciple—Sujat received them and introduced them to the Exalted One, in whose presence he performed several striking miracles. The elders wondered at the miracles of the disciple and thought that if these be the wonders of the child, what must be those of the father. Buddha expounded to them his doctrine in several progressive stages, first on unrighteousness, corruption, vanity, and the impurity of desires, next on the glory of being free from desires; thus when he felt that his listeners' thoughts were prepared and elevated, he discoursed to them on the origin of suffering and the way to remove it, with the result that "as a clean garment, from which all impurity is removed, wholly absorbs within itself the dye, so opened in these eighty thousand village elders, as they sat there, the pure moteless eye of the truth: whatever ■ subject to the law of origination—all such is subject to the law of decease. And discerning the doctrine, having pierced to the doctrine, knowing the doctrine, sinking themselves in the doctrine, overcoming doubts, free from vacillation, having

penetrated to knowledge, needing nothing else in their faith in the Master's doctrine, they spoke to the Exalted One thus: 'Excellent Sire, as a man, O Sire, straightens that which is bowed down, or uncovers the hidden, or shows the way to one who has gone astray, or shows a light in the darkness, so that he who has eyes may be able to see the forms of things, even so has the Exalted One proclaimed the doctrine in manifold discourses: we, O Sire! take our refuge with the Exalted One, and with the doctrine and with the order of his disciples; may the Exalted One receive us as his lay disciples, for from this day henceforth we have taken our refuge with him as long as our life endures.'

It will be easily imagined how widespread must have been the effect of these conversions. The headmen of the village must have spread the doctrine in their villages, and wholesale conversion of the villages must have been the result.

That Buddhism had completely supplanted Brahmanism in the kingdoms of Magadh and Koushal appears to be clear from the ancient records. So far as Koushal is concerned, it was Shakya Muni's home, and the home of his clan, who were naturally attracted to his banner. They had heard of their kinsman's success elsewhere and they felt naturally proud of the fact, and the least they could do was to offer themselves for enlistment in his ranks. But there is no authentic or connected history of his proselytizing mission to that country, though we meet with frequent references of his conversion of Kushal (Koshala) where he appears to have converted the people *en masse* as he did in Magadh. His disciples were for the most part scions of influential and opulent families. European scholars think this a blot on Buddhism in comparison with Christianity. So, comparing Buddhism with Christianity, Prof. Monier-Williams wrote: "Then, although each made use of missionary agency, the one sent forth his high-born learned monks as missionaries to the world at the commencement of his own career, giving them no divine commission, the other waited till the close of His own ministry, then said to His low-born, unlearned disciples. 'As my

Father hath sent me, even do I send you (1).' This is sheer hyper-criticism with which the book abounds. It betrays ignorance of the country in the seventh century B.C. As has been already pointed out, education in those days was the birth-right of the priests, a privilege of the Kahatriya: the Vaishaya needed it only so far as it was necessary for his business, while the Shudra did not at all need it. Now as Buddha drew his converts from all castes and all classes, it was inevitable that his mission should have been most successful with the literate and thoughtful classes; and as there were necessarily the high-born, his first recruits naturally came from that class.

But wherever Buddha went, he naturally went first to the leading families, as the Christian missionary does to-day. These, in their turn, popularised his creed with the masses, sometimes by means, of which Buddha himself would not have approved. For instance, when he visited Kushinagar (Kushinara), the Mallas, who were the ruling family there, went out to meet him, and upon return issued an edict: "Whoever goeth not to meet the Exalted One is liable to a penalty of five hundred pieces,"—was this limiting the doctrine to the rich? The Brahmans had kept women under abject subjection. They were ordained to ever-dependence. It was Buddha who emancipated them, admitted them into his Order, and extended to them his unstinted blessings; and women were amongst some of his most devoted disciples: Such was Vishakha, a rich widow living at Savathi, the capital of Koushal (Kosala), mother of many blooming children and the grand-mother of countless grand-children. As a citizen, she was accorded the first place in her town. She was always invited to sacrificial ceremonies and banquets and allotted the place of honour. When she heard of Buddha's projected visit to Koushal, she made grand preparations to receive him. She received Buddha as her honoured guest. One day when Buddha was dining with her with his disciples, she approached him and said: "Eight requests, Sire, I make of the Exalted

(1) *Buddhism* 555, 556.

One." "The Perfect One is too exalted to grant every wish," said he. "What is allowable, Sire, and what is unblameable?" "Then speak Vishakha!"

"I desire, Lord, my life-long to bestow robes for the rainy season on the Sangh, and food for in-coming Bhikkhus, and food for outgoing Bhikkhus, and food for the sick, and food for those who wait upon the sick, and medicine for the sick, and a constant supply of congey and bathing robes for the nuns."

"But what circumstance is it, O Vishakha, that you have in view in asking these eight boons of the Tathagat?"

"I gave command, Lord, to my slave-girl, saying, 'Go thou to the Arama; and when you are there, announce the time, saying, 'The time, Sirs, has arrived and the meal is ready.' And the slave-girl went, Lord, to the Arama but when she beheld there the Bhikkhus with their robes thrown off, letting themselves be rained down upon, she thought: 'These are not Bhikkhus in the Arama, they are naked ascetics letting the rain fall on them,' and she returned to me and reported accordingly. Impure, Lord, is nakedness and revolting. It was this circumstance, Lord, that I had in view in desiring my life-long to provide the Sangh with special garments for use in the rainy season."

"Moreover, Lord, an in-coming Bhikkhu, not being able to take the direct roads, and not knowing the places where food can be procured, comes on his way wearied out by seeking for alms. But when he has partaken of the food I shall have provided for in-coming Bhikkhus, he will come on his way without being wearied out by seeking for alms, taking the direct road, and knowing the place where food can be procured. It was this circumstance that I had in view in desiring to provide the Sangh my life-long with food for in-coming Bhikkhus."

"Moreover, Lord, an out-going Bhikkhu, while seeking about for alms for himself, may be left behind by the caravan, or may arrive too late at the place whither he desires

to go, and will set out on the road in weariness. But when he has partaken of the food I shall have provided for out-going Bhikkhus, he will not be left behind by the caravan; he will arrive in due time at the place whither he desires to go, and he will set out on the road, when he is not weary. It was this circumstance, Lord, that I had in view in desiring to provide the Sangh, my life-long, with food for out-going Bhikkhus.

"Moreover, Lord, if a sick Bhikkhu does not obtain food, his sickness may increase upon him or he may die. But if a Bhikkhu has taken the diet that I shall have provided for the sick, neither will his sickness increase upon him nor will he die. It was this circumstance, Lord, that I had in view in desiring to provide the Sangh, my life-long, with diet for the sick.

"Moreover, Lord, a Bhikkhu who is waiting upon the sick, if he has to seek out food for himself, may bring in the food (to the invalid) when the sun is already far on his course, and he will lose his opportunity of taking his food. But when he has partaken of the food I shall have provided for those who wait upon the sick, he will bring in food to the invalid in due time, and he will not lose his opportunity of taking his food. It was this circumstance, Lord, that I had in view in desiring to provide the Sangh, my life-long, with food for those who wait upon the sick.

"Moreover, Lord, if a sick Bhikkhu does not obtain suitable medicines, his sickness may increase upon him, or he may die. But if a Bhikkhu has taken the medicines which I shall have provided for the sick, neither will his sickness increase upon him, nor will he die. It was this circumstance, Lord, that I had in view in desiring to provide the Sangh, my life-long, with medicines for the sick.

"Moreover, Lord, the Blessed One, when at Andhakavinda, having in view the ten advantages thereof, allowed the use of congey. It was those advantages I had in view, Lord, in desiring to provide the Sangh, my life-long, with a constant supply of congey.

"Now, Lord, the Bhikkhunis are in the habit of bathing in the river Akiravati, with the courtesans at the same landing-place and naked. And the courtesans, Lord, ridiculed the Bhikkhunis saying, "What is the good, ladies, of your maintaining chastity when you are young? Are not the passions things to be indulged in? When you are old, maintain chastity then; thus will you be obtainers of both ends." Then the Bhikkhunis, Lord, when thus ridiculed by the courtesans, were confused. Impure, Lord, is nakedness for a woman, disgusting, and revolting. It was this circumstance, Lord, that I had in view in desiring to provide the Bhikkhuni Sangh, my life-long, with dresses to bathe in."

"But what was the advantage you had in view for yourself, O Vishakha, in asking these eight boons of the Tathagat?"

"Bhikkhus, who have spent the rainy season in various places will come, Lord, to Savatthi, to visit the Blessed One. And on coming to the Blessed One they will ask, saying, 'Such and such a Bhikkhu, Lord, has died. Where has he been re-born, and what is his destiny?' Then will the Blessed One explain that he has attained to the fruits of conversion, or of the state of the Sakadagamins, or of the state of the Anagamins, or of Arahatsip. And I, going up to them, shall ask, 'Was that brother, Sirs, one of those who had formerly been at Savatthi?'"

"If they should reply to me, 'He had formerly been at Savatthi,' then shall I arrive at the conclusion, 'For a certainty did that brother enjoy either the robes for the rainy season or the food for the in-coming Bhikkhus, or the food for the out-going Bhikkhus, or the food for the sick, or the food for those that wait upon the sick, or the medicine for the sick, or of the constant supply of congey.' Then will gladness spring up within me on my calling that to my mind; and joy will arise to me, thus gladdened; and so rejoicing, all my frame will be at peace; and being thus at peace, I shall experience a blissful feeling of content; and in that bliss my heart will be at rest; and that will be to me an exercise of my

moral sense, an exercise of my moral powers, an exercise of the seven kinds of wisdom. This, Lord, was the advantage I had in view for myself in asking those eight boons of the Blessed One."

"'It is well, it is well, Vishakha. Thou hast done well in asking eight boons of the Tathagat with such advantage in view'.

"And the Blessed One gave thanks to Vishakha the mother of Migara, in these verses :

"'Whatsoever woman, upright in life, a disciple of the Happy One, gives, glad at heart and overcoming avarice, both food and drink, a gift, heavenly, destructive of sorrow, productive of bliss.'

"'A heavenly life does she attain, entering upon the Path that is free from corruption and impurity.'

"'Aiming at good, happy does she become and free from sickness and long does she rejoice in a heavenly body'(¹)."

Though Buddha had received unstinted support from the King and people of Magadh, his success at Koushal was no less great. It was at Bimbeshwar's suggestion that he started to conquer that region, and the success that rewarded his effort filled him with gratification ; so that he visited this kingdom again and again, and it was to this place that he returned again and again, and judging from the Suttas, it was here that he passed most of his later life. It appears that Buddha's first visit to Koushal was by a pre-arrangement with its king, Prasannajit, who had invited him to his kingdom and where he converted the King. He was received in the beautiful garden of Anath Pindik (Anatha Pindika or Anatha Pindadha) the King's Minister, who had laid out a magnificent garden on land which he had purchased from the Crown Prince—Jit, and given it the name of Jitwan or Jit's wood. Anath constructed a monastery in the midst of it under shady trees, which he made over to Buddha and where he afterwards stayed for twenty-three years. He became attached to this place, because, not far

(¹) *Mahavagga VIII*—15.7-14; 17 S.B.E. 219—225.

from it, his foster-mother and aunt Maha Prajapati was buried in its vicinity, and the King had added to it a large lecture-hall for the use of the Order. Maha Prajapati had joined the Order at the urgent solicitations of Anand and with these associations the place soon grew into a place of Buddhist pilgrimages.

Huen Tsiang, when he visited it a thousand years later, found it covered with monasteries in the midst of the most delightful surroundings. The place was full of storied memories of the past. He was shown a place eighteen or nineteen miles to the South where Buddha had first met his father after the absence of twelve years. Ever since the sudden disappearance of his son and heir-apparent, the old disconsolate King had spared no efforts to bring his son back to his home and heritage. He had sent emissaries after emissaries to secure his return; but now that Buddha had achieved success in another field he met him and with all his family embraced his creed. The meeting of the old King with his friar-son after an age must have led to a touching scene, of which we have no record; but one can imagine the meeting of the father and son, so long separated and in such strange surroundings.

In Prasannajit's kingdom Buddha appears to have had to face an organized opposition from the Brahmans, who felt alarmed at the overthrow of their religion and the wholesale conversions of the people to the new faith. They had arranged with the people of Bhadrakar, whom they ruled at their will, that they would not admit Buddha, who was then approaching. When, however, Buddha did arrive, the first person to break the vow was a woman of Kapilvastu who had married in the town, who got out at night, scaled the walls of the city with a ladder and threw herself at the feet of Buddha to become his disciple. Her example was followed by others, including some of the richest citizens of the town, who flocked to his lectures and entered his church. The Brahmans now arranged an open debate, in which the King and the people were to be the umpires. The Brahmans

were checkmated, and the people crowded to embrace the religion of Nirvan.

Now subterfuges and arguments failing, the Brahmans resorted to menaces and threats. Attempts were made upon his life; while a stimulus was given to a counter-movement, in which Dev Dutt, Buddh's cousin and life-long enemy, joined. This movement, to which a further detailed reference will be necessary in the sequel, was started by Buddh's casteman—by name Mahavir. It was no less than another religion—Jainism, the tenets of which were little distinguishable from those of Buddhism; but it was probably the very reason for the bitterness of its attack upon a more popular creed.

When, therefore, the Sutras and the Buddhist memoirs record the triumphal progress of Buddhism, entirely ignoring the hostility of the Brahmans on the one side and of the Jains on the other, of Dev Dutt and his partizans joining the latter, and the unscrupulous attempts made to put an end to the Liberator, we have only one side of the picture and a garbled account of the proselytizing endeavour of the founder of Buddhism. In order to depict a true picture, we have to examine other records and allude to other events. But this must await a separate examination. For the present, it need only be mentioned to complete the life-story.

Buddh had now been preaching his Gospel for a period of twelve years. His name and fame was now upon every one's lips. His creed had supplanted Brahmanism and had become the State creed of the two great kingdoms of Koushal and Magadh. He now bethought himself of his home; and his son, who had by now grown up into a young man, was married and had a daughter Purvika, persuaded the King to send a message to the following effect: "Thy father and mother, some noble ladies headed by Yashoda and this thy young son have come in the hope of seeing thee, under the idea that thou art devoted to the world's salvation; what shall I tell them?" "Buddh was naturally touched with the message and he decided to revisit his home, which he started to do in a great

procession accompanied by his monks and the citizens, Brahman and Rudra being at their head, with great triumph and noise of musical instruments"(1). He visited the fig tree under which he was born and there he met his wife Gopi, his other wives Yashodhara and Utpalvarna, his daughter Saodhani Kaushika, Paurvika, daughter of his son—Rahul and other relations to whom he addressed an affectionate discourse. He then performed the obsequial rites of his mother by the tank Vastya, and received into the community some members of his own family headed by Sundaranand and one hundred and seven citizens.(2) He converted several women led by his own wife, whose heads were shaved and whose hands were provided with staves and who were admitted into the higher rank of his Order. He then proceeded to Kapilvastu where he met his father who requested him to stay on and assume the sovereignty of his state. But Buddh would not hear of it. He suggested that the succession to the throne should go to his grandson, Saunava, as his son Rahul had himself joined his Order, which the reluctant King had to accede to. The old King himself became a willing recruit to his Order and so did the members of his family and of his clan.

The legends touching his home-coming give further details. As previously stated, his old father had kept himself closely in touch with the erratic career of his truant son. He had sent missions after missions and messengers after messengers to reclaim him. He was, however, recalcitrant.

Years rolled by, but the old disconsolate King had not abandoned hopes. He had heard of the growing fame of his ascetic son, who had now become a renowned preacher with disciples everywhere. He again sent a message for the son's return—at least to revisit his father and his home. Buddh was now more favourably disposed to accede to his invitation. He had left home to find the way to salvation, which he had found. He 'received the emissaries and gave them a promise that he would return home, but only to pay his people a

(1) *Buddh Charitra* XVII—26; 49
S.B.E. 198.

(2) *Id.* XVII—27; 49 S.B.E. 198.

hurried visit. He walked back by slow stages, as was his wont, his begging bowl in hand, to revisit the gilded chamber from which, some thirteen years since, he had started on his caparisoned steed in quest of human happiness. Strictly following his ordinary routine, he halted in the Nigrodh-grove adjoining the town of Kapilvastu. His father, his uncles, with their numerous relations and dependants, came in a procession to welcome him; but when they saw him there in a state of mendicancy accompanied by his numerous disciples in the same state, they were too abashed and turned back without inviting him to the next day's meal as was the practice.⁽¹⁾ The next day, therefore, he started at the usual hour in the morning to beg his meal from door to door through the town, which was all agog with the sight of the Prince begging for his meal. His mother ran up to the King and said: "Thy son is walking for alms from door to door." The King became deeply agitated and seizing the end of his outer robe, walked up to where Buddha was and exclaimed: "Illustrious Buddha, why do you expose us all to such shame. Do you think your father cannot support you and your monks? Was it necessary for you to go begging from door to door in my town?" "My noble father," replied Buddha, "This is the custom of our race." "How so," cried the father, "Are you not descended from an illustrious race of Kings? No one of our race before has acted so ignominiously." "My noble father," said Buddha, "You and your family may claim descent from a royal race but I claim descent from the Buddhas of old, and they have always acted so: O Father, I have now found the Law; and when one finds a treasure, to whom can he offer it more fittingly than to his own father? So do I offer it to you. Do not delay; let me share with you the treasure I have found."

Shuddhodhan spake no more. He took hold of his son's bowl and led him home. "There he was welcomed by all the household; but one of them was missing. It was his own

(1) *Jatak Nidan Katha* (Routledge) 222; But *ib.* 6 No. 547 (Oamb) 246 the older men refused to pay homage to Buddha who was younger to them in years.

The next day his step-brother—Nand, (called Anand in the canonical books) his old playmate and the companion of his youth and afterwards his faithful disciple and companion till his death, was to be married, and arrangements had been made for its pompous celebration by holding a great festival.

Gautam went up to the pavilion where Nand was lodged, and told him that "the greatest festival of all is the life of a monk who has vanquished all evil desires, acquired the knowledge of truth, and Nirvan." He then gave him his own alms-bowl and took him to the grove where he had been staying. He persuaded him to join the Order. Nand was at first unwilling; but on the persuasion of his brother, he took the vow and history records him to have been his most devoted disciple. Buddh was now trying to convert his other relations.

(1) *Jatāk, Nidān Kātha* 235.

One day his wife sent young Rahul to his father to ask him for his heritage. Rahul is stated to have asked his mother where his father was, adding that he did not know that he ever had a father. His mother pointed him out of the window : " Look " she said, " that monk whose appearance is so glorious, he is your father." Rahul went to him, touched his feet and told him how happy he felt to see him ! Gautam blessed him. He then asked his father for his inheritance saying : " Father I am the Prince ! when I am crowned a king over all the earth, I have need of the treasure ; for a son is heir to his father's property ;" at which Buddh turning to Sariputra said : " Beloved disciple, Rahul has come to ask me for his inheritance. He asks for a worldly inheritance which cannot last. I will give him a spiritual inheritance which would be everlasting. Let him be admitted to our Order." When Shuddhodhan heard of it, he was greatly distressed. He said that he had already lost his two sons—and now he had lost even his grand-son. He went to Gautam and complained and asked him to make it a rule not to admit children to his Order without their parents' consent, to which he readily assented.

CHAPTER VII.

FROM HIS RETURN TO THE END.

After his return from Kapilvastu, Buddh appears to have settled down to the practice of routine which, he said, he had already settled during the first twelve years of his ministry. As already stated, there is no sequent chronicle of his later years. But the incidental references in the canonical books, notably the Mahavagga, give some clue to the life of the Master, till its close. That work is a collection of his connected essays on the rules and conduct of the monks, of which a synopsis has already been given in the Introduction. It frequently, though casually, refers to the "Blessed One's movements," which appear to have been controlled from three principal centres—Rajgrah, Benares and Savitthi, to each of which places Buddh paid recurrent visits and in each of which he had built large monasteries, equipped with adequate lecture-halls where periodical lectures were delivered both to the clergy and the laity. Thus we know that at Rajgrah fortnightly lectures were thrice delivered; and it is possible that the local needs of his other centres were similarly met. It is also clear from the narrative that before starting from these headquarters Buddh's itinerary was fixed beforehand, as he generally travelled at the head of a large retinue of Bhikkhus numbering several hundreds and sometimes several thousands. The towns and places he had decided to visit, had to make previous arrangement for his reception, and the usual procedure was for the citizens to entertain the party by turns, though sometimes some one, more zealous or charitably disposed, would undertake the entire responsibility for his entertainment. Before paying a visit Buddh's vanguard of monks would visit the place and settle all details as to his accommodation,—the persons whom the honour of a personal visit from the Master was to be accorded, those who were to be presented to him and those who were ready to be accepted into the faith. The requirements of the monks were well known. They would only put up in a grove or camp fixed outside the city walls.

If the ground was wet, sand was spread ; otherwise, grass or leaves. Small temporary huts were put up in other places ; but it was necessary to provide for the monsoon halt, lasting three months and in winter. In the three radiating centres of Buddhism, permanent buildings had already been erected to accommodate the fraternity when they visited them in their circuits ; but elsewhere, the arrangements were temporary, yet so made as to insure the comfort of the visitors and which followed an invitation of which the founder had many from which he, at times, had to make a selection. The Mahavagga mentions forty-five place-names in connection with his itinerary, but there can be no doubt that Buddha must have visited every town and place of note in the two kingdoms.

The procedure on arrival had by now become stereotyped. All leading residents of the town were accorded the honour of a personal visit from the Master. They, in turn, returned his call, taking with them the leading citizens, who listened to the discourse on the one problem of life and death which Buddha had made his own. These sermons were preached with consummate dialectical skill, of which clear hints occur in the Mahavagga. The Master would first deliver an introductory discourse, explaining to the audience what they already knew ; he would then criticize its short-comings and then offer them his own solution. As a rule, this was enough in most cases ; but when at times the Master met some one who was prepared to discuss the subject with him, he adopted the Socratic method of questions and first demolished the questioner's theory, after which he felt the ground clear for the establishment of his own. This was the work done in the open season. In the rains the fraternity assembled in a central camp where they gave an account of the work accomplished and prepared their future programme. A detailed account of this work will have to be presently given. For the present it will suffice if we merely referred to it here.

As the followers grew in number and the number of missionary monks multiplied, the Master must have found his time fully occupied by building up a constitution for the Church.

The Mahavagga contains a record of the points he had decided. It shows the diversity of his activities. He was the final judge in all ecclesiastical matters and the monks, when they disagreed amongst themselves, referred to him all points of dispute and, of course, accepted his decision without question. If his decision was found to raise great points or had to be rescinded or modified, it was referred to him and he generally met the difficulty by rescinding or modifying his previous decision in the manner suggested. The smallest minutiae of the Order could not be settled without reference to him. What the Bhikkhus should eat, what they should avoid, when and how often to eat, what clothes they should wear, whether they should wear shoes, and, if so, of what colour and pattern, should they be leathern, wooden or made of leaves, should their legs be covered, how should they procure cloth for their garments, how and with what they should be dyed, and how and where they should be put out to dry—these and numerous other questions were examined and settled with scrupulous care by the Messiah.

A single example will suffice to shew the relation of the monks to their chief. The former had obtained offerings of robes of various kinds, so that the orange-coloured uniform, which the fraternity wore, was getting varied. So they questioned the Blessed One: "I allow you," he said, "O Bhikkhus, six kinds of robes,—viz., those made of linen, of cotton, of silk, of wool, of coarse cloth, and of hempen cloth." (1) Then arose the next question. The robes were then procured from the rubbish bin or the cemetery. How were they all to obtain them from that source? The rule had to be relaxed and the robes could be procured from elsewhere. Then there arose the question of dyeing them. They were then dyed with cow-dung or with yellow clay. (2) They complained to the Blessed One, who permitted them to be dyed with vegetable dyes.

"At that time the Bhikkhus dyed cloth with unboiled dye; the cloth became evil-smelling."

(1) *Mahavagga* VIII—3—1; 17 S.B.E. (2) *Mahavagga* VIII—10—1; 17 S.B.E. 204. 196, 197.

“ They told this thing to the Blessed one. ‘ I prescribe, O Bhikkhus, that you boil the dye (and use) little dye-pots.’

“ They spilt the dye.

“ ‘ I prescribe, O Bhikkhus, that you put basins (under the dye-pots) to catch the spilt (dye).’

“ At that time the Bhikkhus did not know whether the dye was boiled or not.

“ They told this thing to the Blessed One. ‘ I prescribe, O Bhikkhus, that you let a drop of dye fall into water, or on to your nail (in order to try if the dye is duly boiled)’

“ At that time the Bhikkhus, when pouring the dye out (of the pot) upset the pot ; the pot was broken.

“ They told this thing to the Blessed one. ‘ I prescribe, O Bhikkhus, that you use a dye ladle or a scoop with a long handle.’

“ At that time the Bhikkhus did not possess vessels for keeping dye. They told this thing to the Blessed One.

“ ‘ I prescribe, O Bhikkhus, that you get jars and bowls for keeping the dye.’

“ At that time the Bhikkhus rubbed the cloth against the vessels and the bowls (in which they dyed it); the cloth was rent.

“ They told this thing to the Blessed One.

“ ‘ I prescribe, O Bhikkhus, that you use a (large) trough for dying cloth in ’ ” (1).

But this is only one page of the Mahavagga. There are a thousand pages written in the same strain, which shew how the monks were tied hand and foot to the Blessed One and to what extent his time must have been occupied with settling the minutiae of his Order.

Outside that body, he had to preach to the people and make converts, and prevent relapses and secessions.

It is, therefore, clear that if a formal record of Buddha's daily life were preserved, it could not differ from that of the proselytizing Head of a religious order to-day. At any rate, this is all we know of his daily life beyond the fact that he, like the meanest of his monk, marched on foot—his begging bowl in hand, ate what he got by begging—one meal a day, and that in the forenoon. Like the rest of them, he rose early before the sun-rise, had his ablution and then meditated; after which, he delivered a short discourse to his monks or lay followers. Then he started to obtain food without asking and without using any pressure. Whatever was thrown into his bowl was welcome. It was shared with the rest of the Bhikkhus. The general rule as to the food of the members of the Order is stated quite clearly in the *Patimokkha*⁽¹⁾. Early in the morning after completing the ablution, the fast was broken by eating some fruit and cake with milk or water, the principal meal of the day being taken before noon, between 11 and 12. It consisted of the single course of *dal* ⁽²⁾ which must be finished before the time when the sun casts a shadow. That was the last food of the day, though some small refreshments consisting of fruit or bread, or a sweet drink might be taken in the afternoon specially on occasions of festivity or sickness. A very detailed dietary of what comprised "hard" and what "soft" food was laid down, and the occasion for taking each prescribed. Meat was not banned, though it must not be killed for the purpose of feeding the Bhikkhus. Game was consequently permitted, but no spirituous drinks of any kind. Even at high entertainments the simplicity of diet was strictly enforced and the Master would not permit of the least invidious distinction between his own food and that of his disciples. They all messed in company and even what they got by begging was all commingled to ensure its uniform quality before service.

(1) *Pāṭiṃyā* 37; *Khuddak Pāṭi* § 2; *Buddhism* (Eng.), 160, 164, (Am). 56, 57. *Sullavagga*, XII—2—8; Rhys. Davids' (2) "Boiled pulses or vetches."

The meal did not take long, nor was it taken far beyond a bare necessity.

Then followed a short interval of rest and repose according to the state of the season ; then study, meditation, assemblage of the brethren—pilgrims and disputants from long distances arrived to see the Blessed One. They were not disappointed. Bhikkhus from all quarters came to his rendezvous. As was usual with him, he interviewed them all and put them a few sympathetic questions such as the following : “ Do things go well with you, O Bhikkhus ? Do you get enough to support yourselves with ? Have you kept *Vassa* well in unity, and in concord, and without quarrel, and have you not suffered from want of food ? ”⁽¹⁾ The Bhikkhus then stated their business, asked questions, presented their difficulties. They were discussed and decided. Lay brethren were given a similar welcome and those who came, went away satisfied with the extreme kindness and courtesy of the Blessed One. The Blessed One claimed no special privilege from the fact that he was the founder of his Church. And he accorded to the visitor no special privilege because of his wealth or rank. All were welcome, kings and courtesans, men of high or low degree, and all were equally privileged to be placed on the path to salvation.

The only exceptions sanctioned were those necessitated either by necessity or obvious convenience. Such was, for instance, the relief asked for and given to the Master, when he was aged sixty, ⁽²⁾ when he found his strength failing him. He had till then been carrying his own bowl in his daily rounds, but now he found assistance necessary. Turning to the Bhikkhus he said : “ Bhikkhus, I am bent down with age and infirmities, and worn out through giving counsel to my followers ; you must appoint a Bhikkhu who will attend to my wants.” Several Bhikkhus gladly proffered their services, including the venerable Kaundinya and Mandgalyan, but eventually his choice fell upon

(1) *H. g., Mahavagga*, VII—1 ; 17 S.B.E. 147.

(2) This ■ according to the Chinese legend—Edkins ; *Chinese Buddhism* 41 ; but in the Tibetan legends this is stated to

have occurred when he was 50—Rockhill's *Life of Buddh* 88 in which however Buddh ■ quoted later as giving his own age to be 60 ; Spence Hardy's *Manual* 241.

his own cousin,—Anand, who accepted the office on three conditions, namely, that he should never have to partake of the Blessed One's food, use his underclothes or his cloak ; nor required to accompany him, when he visited a layman, and that he should be free to see and revere him at any time.

Buddh had ordained that in his Order, seniority alone entitled a disciple to precedence which could not be varied by reason of noble birth, wealth, or familiarity with the Rules and Philosophy of the Order ⁽¹⁾. The only exception made was in the case of women, who were, as a class, held in subjection to the male Bhikkhus.

Neither Buddh nor the monks received costly presents. All they wanted was food, shelter and simple clothing and these they could not hoard. The utmost munificence, which a devout benefactor may shew, was then limited to entertaining the brethren to a meal, and if he was inclined to make a gift of land, it at once passed to the Order. Even when a sugar-merchant was met on the way, all he was permitted to do was to treat the Bhikkhus to *sherbat*. He proffered to give them some sugar to take with them, but it was not allowed⁽²⁾. Even this was a treat for which the Master had to grant special dispensation. And when Vishakha entertained the Lord and his monks, the utmost that she was permitted to give was an endowment to provide the Sangh, during her life, with special garments during the rainy season and food to all in-coming and out-going Bhikkhus, and medicines to the sick and food to them and their attendants, and a constant supply of congey and bathing robes to the sisterhood.⁽³⁾

That such must have been his daily life appears from (Buddh-ghosh's) commentary on the first of the dialogues of Buddh. It is overloaded with supernatural details, but, apart from them, it portrays the underlying facts about which there can be scarcely any doubt. He says:—"For the Blessed One used to rise up early (i.e. about 5 A. M.) and, out of consideration for his personal attendant, was wont to wash and dress himself

(1) *Jātak*, No. 37 (Camb.) 92.

(2) *Mahavagga* VIII—15—8—9 ; 17 S.B.E.

(3) *Mahavagga* VI—23-8; 17 S.B.E. 95. 221, 225.

without calling for any assistance. Then, till it was time to go on his round for alms, he would retire to a solitary place and meditate. When that time arrived, he would dress himself completely in the three robes (which every member of the Order wore in public), take his bowl in his hand and, sometimes alone, sometimes attended by his followers, would enter the neighbouring village or town for alms, sometimes in an ordinary way, sometimes wonders happening such as these:—As he went towards the village, soft breeze would waft before him cleaning the way, drops of rain would fall from the sky to lay the dust, and clouds would hover over him, spreading as it were a canopy protecting him from the sun. Other breezes would waft flowers from the sky to adorn the path; the rough places would be made plain and the crooked straight, so that before his feet the path would become smooth and the tender flowers receive his foot-steps. And betimes a halo of six hues would radiate from his form (as he stood at the threshold of the houses) illuminating with their glory, like trails of yellow, gold or streamers of grey cloth, the gables and verandahs round about. The birds and beasts around would, each in his own place, give forth a sweet and gentle sound to welcome him, and heavenly music was wafted through the air, and the jewellery of men was jingled sweetly of itself.

At signs like these, the sons of men could know:—‘To-day it is the Blessed One who has come for alms’. Then clad in their best and brightest, and bringing garlands and nosegays with them, they would come forth into the street and, offering their flowers to the Blessed One, would vie with one another, saying, ‘To-day, Sir, take your meal with us; we will make provision for ten, and we for twenty, and we for a hundred of your followers’. So saying they would take his bowl, and, spreading mats for him and his attendant followers, would await the moment when the meal was over. Then would the Blessed One, when the meal was done, discourse to them, with due regard to their capacity for spiritual things, in such a way that some would take the layman’s vow, and some would enter on the paths, and some would reach the highest fruit thereof. And when he thus had mercy on the multitude, he would

arise from his seat and depart to the place where he had lodged. And when he had come there, he would sit in the open verandah, awaiting the time when the rest of his followers should also have finished their meal. And when his attendant announced they had done so, he would enter his private apartment. Thus was he occupied up to the mid-day meal.

“Then afterwards, standing at the door of his chamber, he would give exhortation to the brethren such as this: ‘Be earnest, my brethren, strenuous in effort. Hard is it to meet with a Buddh in the world. Hard is it to attain to the state of (that is, to be born as) a human being. Hard is it to find a fit opportunity. Hard is it to abandon the world. Difficult to attain is the opportunity of hearing the word’.

“Then would some of them ask him to suggest a subject for meditation suitable to the spiritual capacity of each, and when he had done so, they would retire each to the solitary place he was wont to frequent, and meditate on the subject set. Then would the Blessed One retire within the private chamber, perfumed with flowers, and calm and self-possessed, would rest awhile during the rear of the day. Then when his body was rested he would arise from the couch and for a space consider the circumstances of the people near, that he might do them good. And at the fall of the day the folk from the neighbouring villages or town would gather together at the place where he was lodging, bringing with them offerings of flowers. And to them, seated in the lecture-hall, would he, in a manner suitable to the occasion, and suitable to their beliefs, discourse of the Truth. Then, seeing that the proper time had come, he would dismiss the folk, who, saluting him, would go away. Thus was he occupied in the afternoon.

“Then at the close of the day, should he feel the need of the refreshment of a bath, he would bathe, while some brother of the Order attendant on him would prepare the divan in the chamber, perfumed with flowers. And in the evening he would sit awhile alone, still in all his robes, till the brethren, returned from their meditations, began to assemble.

Then some would ask him questions on things that puzzled them, some would speak of their meditations, some would ask for an exposition of the Truth. Thus would the first watch of the night pass, as the Blessed One satisfied the desire of each, and then they would take their leave. And part of the rest of the night would he spend in meditation, walking up and down outside his chamber; and part he would rest lying down, calm and self-possessed, within. And as the day began to dawn, rising from his couch he would seat himself, and calling up before his mind the folk in the world, he would consider the aspirations which they, in previous births, had formed, and think over the means by which he could help them to attain thereto".⁽¹⁾

But, of course, this routine, though usual, was not strictly adhered to. Nor could it be. If he was invited out to a meal, he would seize the opportunity to deliver a discourse; while, in places provided with lecture-halls, they would be utilized for the delivery of sermons. But this would only be in the months of cold weather, from December to February. On other days the people would meet in a grove or in some open woodland, and the lectures and discussions, interviews and audiences were prolonged till late at night, while on moonlit nights they would be extended to even the small hours of the morning.

It was Buddh's rule never to make a home anywhere. Even selected centres, such as Rajgrah, Gaya, Benares and Savitthi—he always treated as his camps. From there he would sally out frequently, always walking bare-footed with his Bhikkhus. He never used a conveyance or a pony. He would walk fifteen or twenty miles from village to village, and it was not in every village that he would make a halt. His itinerary was, as already stated, pre-arranged; though he had often to alter it, if compelled to do so by the solicitude of some one who pressed on him to break his journey.

This became more and more frequent as his popularity grew, and the fact that he was a hermit-prince added to the

(1) *Sumangal Vilasini*, 45-48; *Ryan. Davids' Buddhism* (Am. Ed), 108-112.

embarrassment ■ his receptions. But his very success created for him fresh enemies who seemed to have arisen out of nothing. And they put new heart into his old enemies, who hemmed him in from all sides and at one time threatened his very life. Foremost amongst them was his cousin Dev Dutt whose name has already been mentioned. He had always cherished a lurking dislike for Buddh. He had competed for the hand of his bride at the tournament in which Buddh was successful. The Tibetan texts, or the Northern canon as well as the Jaatak⁽¹⁾ give circumstantial details of the growing opposition within his own ranks, supported by that of the rival-sects which sprang up to challenge his mission. The Brahmans, who had been long in possession of the field and had rallied to his cause, found their faith shaken by the attacks levelled both against him personally and his system by the combined force of his opponents.

Amongst them was Vardhman, afterwards known as Mahavir, the founder of Jainism. Like Buddh he too was a Kshatriya by birth. But unlike Buddh, he did not profess to reveal a new doctrine of his own, but was content to found his teaching on that of the ancient ascetic—Parasnath, who is said to have lived two and a half centuries earlier; while Dev Dutt attempted to discredit his cousin by founding his teachings on the “former Buddhs”. Like Buddh, Mahavir was also the scion of a noble Licchavi family of Vaishali. He too had come out of the purple to become an ascetic. He first embraced the ascetic cult of Parasnath in which he remained for some years. But he was dissatisfied with the rules of that order and broke away from it and started a creed of his own in which, however, he professed still to be only interpreter of the older doctrine. The main points of his teaching were, however, so akin to Buddhism that Jainism was at one time regarded as being only an offshoot of Buddhism. But the two creeds were always distinct, though their principles were similar and in some respects identical. They will be examined later on. Like Buddh,

(1) II (*Camb.*) No. 206, 106;
Ib. No. 208; No. 194, 85, 87.

p. 110; VI—194 p. 68.

Mahavir was related to the ruling families of Magadh, Videh and Anga, and like Buddha he claimed the patronage and support of Bimbeshwar who, as well as his son—Ajat Shatru, appears to have equally subscribed to his doctrine. Then, again, like Buddha, Mahavir too lived to a great age. He is said to have been translated to heaven when over seventy in 527 B.C., that is, only four years before Buddha's death. He died at Pawa in the Patna district and his adherents are then stated to have exceeded 14,000 in number.

It is thus clear that at least in his earlier career, Buddha must have encountered considerable opposition from Mahavir, to which must be added the numerous pin-pricks he must have received from numerous other cults which had been launched by other teachers since forgotten. All of them appealed to the masses through the medium of miracles, the display of which Buddha rigidly forbade, and which must have lost to his religion much of its attractiveness. That this must have considerably handicapped his disciples and filled them with misgivings is clear from the following dialogue: "One of the disciples came to the Blessed One with a trembling heart and his mind full of doubt. And he asked the Blessed One: 'O Buddha, our Lord and Master, why do we give up the pleasures of the world, if you forbid us to work miracles to attain the supernatural? Is not Amitabha, the infinite light of revelation, the source of innumerable miracles?'

"And the Blessed One, seeing the anxiety of a truth-seeking mind, said: 'O Shravak, thou art a novice among the novices, and thou art swimming on the surface of Sansar.'⁽¹⁾ How long will it take thee to grasp the truth? Thou hast not understood the words of the Tathagat. The law of Karm is irrefragable, and supplications have no effect, for they are empty words.'

"Said the disciple, 'Do you say there are no miraculous and wonderful things?'

"And the Blessed One replied:

(1) Skt. "*Sansar*," "world," "worldliness."

“ Is it not a wonderful thing, mysterious and miraculous to the worldling, that a sinner can become a saint, that he who attains to true enlightenment will find the path of truth and abandon the evil ways of selfishness? ‘ The Bhikkhu who renounces the transient pleasures of the world for the eternal bliss of holiness, performs the only miracle that can truly be called a miracle.’

“ A holy man changes the curses of Karm into blessings. The desire to perform miracles arises either from covetousness or from vanity”.⁽¹⁾

Then there were the sacrifices and self-mortification of the Brahmans. Those self-tortures appealed far more to the masses than the abstruse philosophy of Buddhism. Dev Dutt took advantage of it and embodied bodily suffering as a part of his creed.⁽²⁾ “ Sirs”, said he to his hearers: “ The Shraman Gautam makes use of curds and milk; henceforth we will not make use of them, because by so doing one harms calves; the Shraman Gautam makes use of meat; but we will not use it, because if one does, living creatures are killed; the Shraman Gautam makes use of salt; but we will not use it, because it is produced from a mass of sweat; the Shraman Gautam wears gowns with cut fringes; but we will wear gowns with long fringes, because by his practice the skilful work of the weavers is destroyed; the Shraman Gautam lives in the wilds; but we will live in villages, because by his practice men cannot perform works of charity.”⁽³⁾ But in spite of these drawbacks Buddhism was making a giant headway and it soon took a national development. The Shakyas had always regarded the new movement with enthusiasm. In the fervour of their zeal, they decided upon a course of conscription to the new faith, and had it proclaimed that at least one man out of every family should enter the order of Bhikkhus. Buddh was at first reluctant to give his consent; but he was prevailed upon to yield, and his later life was embittered by the after-math of this ill-judged step.

(1) *Gospel of Buddh*, 150, 151.

(2) *Udangory*, (T.O.S.) 204.

(3) *Tibetan Legends* (See *Bibliography*).

The rank of the Bhikkhus was reinforced by conscript monks who soon broke out in open revolt. And Dev Dutt taking advantage of them became their leader. And the schism gained further strength from the support of Ajatshatru, heir-apparent of Magadh.

But the old king remained true to his vow and he was consequently either assassinated or starved to death by his son with the help of Dev Dutt.⁽¹⁾ The question whether Bimbeshwar was assassinated or starved by Ajatshatru, who had become tired of his father's long reign, is not free from doubt; since, while it has been suggested that Ajatshatru's sympathy with the Buddhists gave their rivals—the Jains, an offence which they translated into the malicious legend of Ajatshatru's parricide, the Vinai gives a short account of an attempt made by Ajatshatru to kill his father with a sword,⁽²⁾ while in the Digha⁽³⁾ a detailed account of the parricide appears, leaving no doubt that after his sixty years' rule the old king had been done to death by his son who had long curbed his ambition to usurp the throne—an ambition to which he gave full vent by his notable conquests. He is stated to have afterwards confessed his crime⁽⁴⁾. Kushal Devi—Bimbeshwar's widow, soon afterwards died of grief⁽⁵⁾.

Buddh had to fly for safety, and it was only by a miracle that he escaped the catapult and the wild elephant let loose against him in a narrow street. In later years Ajatshatru was accused of parricide, but he countered the suspicion by showing his staunch adherence to Buddhism, which the legends ascribe to a miracle. Dev Dutt was discomfited but he did not despair. Baffled in his attempt to usurp the spiritual leadership from his cousin, he now resorted to the baser art of seducing his wife, with whose aid he hoped to obtain recognition as the leader of the Shakya people. But the wife contemptuously

(1) *Tibetan Legends*, 90.

(2) *Jatak*, II—203; *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I page 184.

(3) *Sanjyana* I—84-86.

(4) *Digha* 1 *S.B.E.* 85; I *Jatak* (Camb.) No. 150; 319.

(5) *Jatak* (Camb.) 85-319 II—203;

Digha Nikaya *I.S.B.E.* ■ *Cambridge History of India* Vol. I—184. But according to another version, she became a devout Buddhist and it is to her that Buddha addressed his discourse on the beatitude of future life.

rejected his offer ; while the Shakyas would have none of him. He became a desperado till he was hurled into hell, which closed his career.⁽¹⁾

But according to the Tibetan Legends, the mass conversion of the Shakyas and their pride hastened their destruction. The Shakyas were in alliance with, if not the vassals of King Prasannjit of Koushal. Now Prasannjit happened to have only one son—named Rali by a woman of low caste. This boy, when eight years of age, had mounted his father's lion throne, whereupon the Shakyas made a jest calling him a bastard. He recalled the insult, when on his father's death, he ascended the throne ; and finding the Shakyas weak attacked them with overwhelming numbers ; but the latter met them with force and repulsed their attack. Virudhak's army was disheartened and the King asked his minister Ambharish to advise him what to do. The minister rallied the troops and assured them that the Shakyas being Buddhists would not take life and that they ran no risk in pursuing the attack.

Meanwhile, having repulsed the attack, the Shakyas shut themselves up within their gates and prepared themselves against a seige. But a council of war decided otherwise and issued a proclamation prohibiting any one from attacking Virudhak or his army. But one Shampak⁽²⁾, who was then out of the town and had not heard of the proclamation, hastily raised a levy and wrought great slaughter on the invaders. But when he attempted to enter Kapilvastu, the Shakyas forbade his entry on the ground that he had disobeyed their proclamation. He went to Buddha who gave him some of his hair, nail-parings and a tooth, and bearing them he left and founded the kingdom of Udayan in a country watered by the Swat, a tributary of the Kabul river. He built a stupa for the relics of the Blessed One and it was called Shampak's stupa. Others who had taken part in

(1) *Tibetan legends* (Tr. W. W. Rockhill) under title *Life of the Buddha* T.-O.-S. 82—107.

[1] Hsuen Tsang (*Bk. VI—318*) says

that there were four such men who afterwards became kings of Udayan, Samyan, Himtal and Chambea respectively.

repulsing the invaders were similarly banished⁽¹⁾. But their spirited defence disconcerted Virudhak who turning to Ambharish asked: "Are these your righteous people who will not kill even a beetle? ■ they all kill as many of us as this one man, there will not be left a soul living among us!"

The minister suggested a stratagem to overcome the Shakyas. So the King sent an emissary to them saying, "Shakyas! although I do not love you; equally I do not hate you. It is all over, so open your gates quickly." The Shakyas were divided but decided to abide by the votes of the majority who, remembering the Master's Commandment—"Thou shalt not kill"—voted for the entry. The gates were thrown open and Virudhak entered the city with his army and contrary to his understanding, commenced a wholesale slaughter of the Shakyas who took to flight, some going to Nepal, others to Rajgrah. More, who could not escape, were slaughtered, Virudhak demanding that he would not be satisfied till he saw a stream of blood of the slain running down the road. His men accordingly butchered 77,000 Shakyas, mostly believers, but as their blood was insufficient to make a stream, Virudhak's ministers diluted it with red lac mixed with water. The king was satisfied, his men had captured 500 young men and an equal number of maidens whom he ordered to be trampled to death by elephants. As, however, they defended themselves, he had them thrown into a pit and covered it over with iron plates⁽²⁾.

Buddh himself was an eye-witness to all this cruel savagery. Having glutted his ire upon the defenceless Shakyas, Virudhak returned to Koushal with 500 Shakya maidens as his prisoners of war whom he tried to throw into his harem, but they mocked him and would not go. He became angry and ordered that their hands and feet should be chopped off and that they should then be set free to return to their homes. Buddh preached to them the Law after which they all died⁽³⁾.

(1) *Huen Tsang Bk.*, III—141 *et seq.*
 ■ *Rockhill*, 119, 120.

(2) ■ *Hien* 87; *Huen Tsang Bk.*
 VI—207; *Rockhill* 131.

Virudhak had invited Jeta his natural brother and minister of the State to accompany him in his campaign, but being a proselyte and patron of Buddhism, he had refused. Virudhak now returned triumphant called upon Jeta to explain his disloyalty. "Jeta" he said, "I have come from putting to death my enemies and you have remained here amusing yourself." "Sire," answered the Prince, "who are your enemies?" "The Shakyas" he replied. "If the Shakyas are your enemies" replied Jeta, "who are your friends?" At this the King got annoyed—"Have him sent to where the Shakyas are!" So Jeta was also put to death⁽¹⁾.

This legend depicts the decline and fall of Kapilvastu before Buddh's own eyes, of which he was a helpless observer. The downfall of his race and the sack of his capital by a horde of barbarians from the north points to a great misfortune which swept away all that Buddh must have esteemed dear in this life. That he was a tender-hearted man and attached to his family is apparent from the deep concern he showed for them after he had well-established his creed. That his closing days must have given him cause for melancholy reflexion goes without saying. But the episode shows that Buddh was prepared to suffer martyrdom for his faith. He had offered his family and his race as a holocaust; and he met his death with the same equanimity with which he had faced the despoliation of his home.

The legends do not state whether the destruction of the Shakyas preceded or followed Shuddhodhan's own death. But the context suggests that it must have been later. Shuddhodhan is said to have died when he had reached the ripe age of ninety-six. Finding his end approaching, he sent a message to Buddh, who hurried back to his father's death-bed. He led the coffin carrying in hand the incense-holder, and, as was the custom, with his own hand set fire to the pyre of sandal-wood in which the remains of the old king were consumed.

(1) *Dulva*, X—132, 161; *Hien Tsang Ek.* VI, 307; *Rockhill*, 120, 121.

But though the sequence of the events of his life after his return from Kapilvastu is lost, the legends record numerous incidents which illustrate his character. Once upon a time, two neighbouring kings, no less than of his own kinsmen, the Shakyas and the Koliyas were on the verge of war over a disputed embankment of the Rohini which, owing to an unusual drought, was unable to irrigate the fields on both sides of the river. And Buddha seeing the kings with their armies ready to fight, asked them why they were going to fight. Each claimed the embankment. "I understand that the embankment has value for some of your people, but apart from it, does it possess any intrinsic value?"

"It has no intrinsic value whatever" was the reply. Then asked Buddha "Now when you go to battle, is it not sure that many of your men will be slain, and you yourselves, O Kings, are liable to lose your lives?"

And they said: "Verily, it is sure that many will be slain and our own lives be jeopardised."

"Has the blood of men" asked Buddha, "less value than a mound of earth?" "No" said the kings, "The lives of men, and above all, the lives of kings, are priceless."

Then said Buddha: "Are you going to stake that which is priceless against that which has no intrinsic value whatever?"

The two kings realized their mistake and came to an amicable arrangement.⁽¹⁾

A merchant from Sunparant having joined the Order was anxious to convert his relations. He asked for permission to do so. "The people of Sunparant are reported to be exceedingly violent. If they revile you, what will you do?" "I will make no answer," replied the Bhikkhu. "And if they strike you?" "I will not strike in return." "And if they try to kill you?" "Death itself is no evil and many even

(1) *Dhammapad*, 10 *S.B.E. Pt. I* (Ed. Faushok) 351; *Jatak* V—412; Hardy's *Manual of Buddhism*, 317, 319.

try to escape from the vanities of life : I will take no steps to hasten or delay my departure." Then Buddh gave him permission to start on his mission.

One Krishnagotami (Kisagotami) was a young married girl who was delivered of a child. He lived long enough to run about and then died. She was disconsolate and carried its corpse from door to door asking her fellow-villagers to revive it by medicine. One of them advised her to try Buddh, which she did. After doing homage she asked him, " Lord and Master, do you know any medicine that will revive my child ? " " Yes I know," he replied. " What is it ? " she asked. " I want some mustard-seeds," he said. But before she had left to fetch it, he added. " But it must come from a house where there has been no death." " Very good," she said, " I will get you such mustard-seed." She then returned to the village, and went from door to door asking the people for mustard-seed, every one offered it to her but when she added, " it must be from a house which has not suffered death." Every one cried that he had lost either the father, the wife, or a son. She returned to Buddh who asked her if she had brought the seed. " No," she replied, " I cannot get seed from a house where there has been no death." " Well then," added Buddh, " How can you be an exception ? " He then preached to her his Law and she entered the " first path."

That Buddh did not always receive courtesy in his excursions is illustrated by the two following stories. When he was staying at Shravasti in the Jitvan, he went out with his alms-bowl, as usual to beg for food. He stopped at the house of a Brahman while the fire of an offering was blazing upon his altar. Afraid, lest the approach of the beggar should pollute him, he said, " Stay there, O shaveling ; stay there ; O wretched Shraman ! thou art an outcast !."

The Blessed One replied : " Who is an outcast ? "

" An outcast is a man who is angry and bears hatred ; the man who is wicked and hypocritical, he who embraces error and is full of deceit.

"Whosoever is a provoker and is avaricious, has sinful desires, is envious, wicked, shameless, and without fear to commit sins, let him be known as an outcast.

"Not by birth does one become an outcast, not by birth does one become a Brahman, by deeds one becomes an outcast, by deeds one becomes a Brahman."

The Brahman joined his faith. ⁽¹⁾ He had sometimes to deal with hooligans. Such was Shushilome whom he met at Gaya. Buddha was sitting on a stone when Shushilome went up to him and brushed his body against his. Bhagwat drew away his body; thereupon Shushilome asked him "O Shraman, art thou afraid of me?" To which Gautam replied: "No, friend, I am not afraid of thee, but thy touching me is sinful." Shushilome said: "I will ask thee a question, O Shraman, and if thou canst not answer it, I will either scatter thy thoughts or cleave thy head, or take thee by the feet and throw thee over to the other shore of the Ganges."

The Bhagwat answered: "I do not see, O friend, either in this world or in the world of the Devas, Maras, Brahmans, or amongst the generation of Samans and Brahmans, gods and man, one who can either scatter my thoughts or cleave my head or take me by the feet and throw me across the Ganges. However, ask, O friend, what thou pleasest."

Shushilome then put to him questions which the Bhagwat replied, but whether he converted him is not recorded. ⁽²⁾

He was once accused of being a sturdy beggar when he ought to be working for his living. The occasion was that he went to beg of a Brahman named Bharaddwaj who had been celebrating his harvest-thanksgiving. Bharaddwaj told him to go and work. "O Shraman" he said, "it would suit you better to go to work than to go begging. I plough and sow, and having ploughed and sown, I eat. If you did likewise, you too would have to eat."

And the Tathagat replied "O Brahman, I too plough and sow, and having ploughed and sown, I eat."

(1) M. V.—4; ■ S.B.E. 73-79.

(2) K. V.—5; 10 S.B.E. 44, 45.

"Do you profess to be a farmer?", the Brahman queried; "where then are your bullocks? where is the seed and the plough?"

The Blessed One said: "Faith is the seed I sow; good works are the rain that fertilizes it; wisdom and modesty are the plough, my mind is the guiding rim; I lay hold of the handle of the law; earnestness is the goad I use; and exertion is my draught-ox. This ploughing is ploughed to destroy the weeds of illusion. The harvest it yields is the immortal life of Nirvan, and thus all sorrow ends."

Then the Brahman poured rice-milk into a golden bowl and offered it to the Blessed One saying: "Let the teacher of mankind partake of the rice-milk, for the venerable Gautam ploughs a ploughing that bears the fruit of immortality." (1)

In this way Buddha passed the closing years of his life. He was now eighty and a detailed account of his closing months is available (2), though it is only a record of tradition. In the course of his peregrination he left Rajgrah and arrived at Pataligama (modern Patna) where he was met by lay devotees to whom he delivered a religious sermon. They invited him to a meal for which they made preparations in the rest-house by strewing the whole floor with sand, placing seats and a water-pot thereon and fixing an oil-lamp. The Blessed One arrived, he washed his feet, entered the rest-house, and took his seat against the central pillar, with his face towards the east. The lay devotees and the Bhikkhus did likewise.

After taking their meal, the Blessed One delivered a sermon upon Rectitude, which lasted till late at night, after which he went into solitude in order to give himself up to meditation. He rose at dawn and saw that Sunidha and Vassakar, two ministers of Magadh, were fortifying the town to repel an invasion by the Vajjis. He then fore-told its future greatness:

(1) *Sutta Nipat*, 4; 10 S.B.E., 11—15.

(2) *Mahaparinirvan Sutta*, 1—19: 11—3; 11—16-24. (R. Davids *Intro. to his Tr.* pp. XXXIV). This is with a few unimportant variations, word for

word the same as *Mahavagga* Ch. 28—30; 17 S.B.E. 97—108. (But this contains no account of Buddha's death. See *Ib.*, p. 97 f.n. (1).

"As far, Anand, as Aryan people dwell, as far as merchants travel, this will become the chief town, the city of Pataliputra. But dangers of destruction, Anand, will hang over Pataliputra in three ways, by fire, or by water, or by internal discord"⁽¹⁾. This prophecy came true for when King Ajatshatru, son of Bimbeshwar, became the King of Magadh, his fortress of Patali on the Sone developed into the imperial city of Pataliputra, and it is now Patna, the capital of Bihar. He now crossed the Ganges and proceeded North to the town of Vaishali, which he had frequently visited and which was the capital of the powerful clan of Licchavis, then a noble city ten of twelve miles in circuit. Near Vaishali, in the village of Beluva he dismissed his disciples, as the rains were on and he was preparing himself for the Vassa which proved to be the last of his life.

At that village, not far from Vaishali, he was attacked by severe illness : violent pains seized him and he was near dying. He then bethought himself of his disciples : "It becomes me not to enter the Nirvan without having addressed those who cared for me. I shall conquer this illness by my power, and hold life fast within me." By the sheer exercise of his will, he cured himself of the illness, and sat down on a seat prepared for him in the shade. Seeing him, the venerable Anand spake : 'Sire ! I see that the Exalted One is well ; I see Sire ! that the Exalted One is better. All nerve had left me, Sire ; I was faint ; my senses failed me because of the sickness of the Exalted One. But still I had one consolation, Sire : the Exalted One will not enter Nirvan, until he has declared his purpose concerning the body of his followers.' "What need hath the body of my followers of me now, Anand : I have declared the doctrine, Anand, and I have made no distinction between within and without ; the Perfect One has not, Anand, been a forgetful teacher of the Doctrine. He, Anand, who says : 'I will rule over the Church, or let the Church be subject to me,' he, O Anand, might declare his will in the Church. The Perfect One, however, O Anand, does not say : 'I will rule over the Church, or let the Church be subject to

⁽¹⁾ *Mahavagga*, VI—28-8 ; 17 S. B. E. 102.

me.' What shall the Perfect One declare, Anand, to be his purpose, regarding the Church? I am an old man; eighty years old am I.....Be ye to yourselves, Anand, your own light, your own refuge, seek no other refuge.....Whosoever now, Anand, or after my departure, shall be his own light, his own refuge, and shall seek no other refuge, whosoever taketh the truth as his light and his refuge and shall seek no other refuge, such will henceforth, Anand, be my true disciple, who walks in the right path"(1).

Buddh now proceeded to Vaishali and as usual passed through the town begging his meal. Returning to his lodging he convened a Sangh and addressed them as follows:—
 "Learn ye then fully, O my disciples, that knowledge which I have attained and have declared unto you, and walk ye in it, practise and increase, in order that this path of holiness may last and long endure, for the blessing of many people, for the joy of many people, to the relief of the world, to the welfare, the blessing, the joy of gods and men. And what, O disciples, is the knowledge which I have attained and have declared unto you, which you are to learn fully, walk in it, practise and increase, in order that this path of holiness may last and long endure, for the blessing of many people, for the joy of many people, to the relief of the world, to the welfare, the blessing, the joy of gods and men? It is the four-fold vigilance, the four-fold right effort, the four-fold holy strength, the five organs, the five powers, the seven members of knowledge, the sacred eight-fold path. This, O disciples, is the knowledge which I have attained, and have declared unto you."

He then added: "Hearken, ye monks, I say unto you, all earthly things are transitory; strive on without ceasing. In a short time the Perfect One will attain Nirvan: three months hence will the Perfect One enter Nirvan." Concluding his discourse, he said: "My existence is ripening to its close; the end of my life is near. I go hence, ye remain behind; the place of refuge is ready for me. Be watchful, without intermission, walk ever more in holiness: Aye resolute, and

(1) Oldenberg, *Buddhism*, 197, 198: Later quotations are also from the same works.

aye prepared, keep ye, O disciples, your mind. He who ever more walks without stumbling, true to the word of truth, struggles into freedom from birth and death, presses through to the end of all suffering."

The next day he again begged in the town, and accepted the hospitality of one Chanda, a black-smith who treated the Sangh to a feast the nature of which will be presently discussed. He then left it with a large concourse of disciples for Kushinagar ⁽¹⁾, a town about eighty miles east of Kapilvastu, where he was born. He was sick and way-worn and as he felt his end drawing nigh, he spake to Anand: "It may be, Anand, that in some of you the thought may arise—'the words of our Teacher are ended; we have lost our Master.' But it is not thus. The truths and the rules of the Order, which I have taught and preached, let these be your teacher, when I am gone."⁽²⁾

Then he addressed the assembled monks: "Which, then, O monks, are the truths it behoves you to spread abroad, out of pity for the world, for the good of gods and men?"

"They are: (1) the four earnest reflections ⁽³⁾; (2) the four right exertions ⁽⁴⁾; (3) the four paths to supernatural power ⁽⁵⁾; (4) the five forces ⁽⁶⁾; (5) the proper use of the five organs of senses; (6) the seven limbs of knowledge ⁽⁷⁾; (7) the noble eight-fold path ⁽⁸⁾".

He then felt tired and turning to Anand, he said: "Go Anand and prepare a bed for me between two twin trees with my head to the North. I am tired, Anand; I shall lie down". Anand prepared a bed between two Sal trees—the trees in the shadow of which he was born. He lay, it is said, on his right

(1) Now Kasia 35 miles east of Gorakhpur on an old channel of the Hiranyavati or the Chota Gandhak—Ounningham's "Ancient Geography of India" 430.

(2) *Mahaparinirvan Sutta*, III—65.

(3) "Impurities of the body, the impermanence of the sensations, of the thought, of the condition of Existence."

(4) "To prevent demerit from arising, get rid of it as soon as it arises; produce merit, and increase it."

(5) i.e., "Will, effort, thought, con-

centration."

(6) i.e., "Faith, energy, recollection, self concentration, reason."

(7) i.e., "Recollection, investigation, energy, joy, serenity, concentration and equanimity".

(8) "Right belief; Right resolve; Right speech; Right work; Right livelihood; Right exercise; Right mindfulness; Right mental concentration."

For explanation see post.

side. As he lay on the cot, the Sal trees burst into bloom, a shower of flowers fell from the sky and heavenly melodies were sounded in honour of the dying saint.

"Then spake the Exalted One to the Venerable Anand: 'Although this is not the time for flowers, Anand, yet are these two twin trees completely decked with blossoms, and flowers are falling, showering, streaming down on the body of the Perfect One.....heavenly melodies are sounding in the air in honour of the Perfect One. But to the Perfect One belongeth another honour, another glory, another reward, another homage, another reverence. Whosoever, Anand, male disciple or female disciple, lay brother or lay sister, lives in the truth, in matters both great and small, and lives according to the ordinance and also walks in the truth in details, these bring to the Perfect One the highest honour, glory, praise, and credit. Therefore, Anand, must ye practise thinking: let us live in the truth in matters, great and small, and let us live according to the ordinance and walk in the truth also in details.'"

But Anand was in a different mood. He said to himself: "I am not yet free from impurities, I have not yet reached the goal, and my Master, who takes pity on me, will soon enter into Nirvan."

He went into the house and cried. But the Master sent for him: "Go, O disciple, and say to Anand in my name, the Master wishes to speak with thee, friend Anand." Anand obeyed. He went to the Master, bowed to him and sat down, still weeping. But the Master tried to console him—"Not, so, Anand, weep not, sorrow not. Have I not ere this said to thee, Anand, that from all that man loves and from all that man enjoys, from that must man part, must give it up, and tear himself from it. How can it be Anand, that that which is born, grows, is made, which is subject to decay, should not pass away? That cannot be. But thou, Anand, hast long honoured the Perfect One, in love and kindness, with cheerfulness, loyally and unwearyingly, in thought, word and deed. Thou hast done well, Anand, only strive on, soon thou wilt be free from impurities."



(7) Panel illustrating 4 scenes of Buddha's life.

As the news of the Saint's illness spread through the town, it all turned out—men with their wives and children to pay their last homage to the dying Master. And Subhadda, a monk of another sect, begged to receive the Master's touch of conversion, so that he could say that he had seen the Master in the flesh.

It was now night and the Master's strength was ebbing. He turned to Anand again and spake—"It may be Anand, that ye shall say: 'the world had lost its master, we have no master more.' Ye must not think thus, Anand. The Law, Anand, and the ordinance, which I have taught and preached unto ye, these are your Master when I am gone hence."

And turning to his disciples—"Hearken: that cometh, I charge ye, Everything that cometh into being, passeth away: Strive without ceasing."⁽¹⁾

But the Chinese version of the "Dying Instructions of Buddh" translated between 397 and 415 A.D. from an earlier Sanskrit text, is even more touching: "It was now in the middle of the night, perfectly quiet and still; for the sake of his disciples he delivered a summary of the Law. After laying down the rules of a good life, he proceeds to reveal the inner doctrines of his faith: 'The heart is lord of the senses: govern, therefore, your heart, watch well the heart.....Think of the fire that shall consume the world, and early seek deliverance from it. Lament not my going away, nor feel regret. For if I remained in the world, then what would become of the Church? It must perish without fulfilling its end. From henceforth all my disciples, practising their various duties, shall prove that my true Body, the Body of the Law⁽²⁾, is everlasting and imperishable. The world is fast bound in fetters: I now give it deliverance as a physician who gives heavenly medicine; keep your mind on my teaching; all other things change, this changeth not. No more shall I speak to

⁽¹⁾ *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sutta*, III—66.

⁽²⁾ Sk. "Dharm Kaya" Dharm—Faith,

religion, Duty; Kaya—body.

you. I desire to depart. I desire the eternal rest ⁽¹⁾. This ■ my last sermon' ⁽²⁾.

And these were his last words. He became unconscious and then passed away."

A legend records that when the soul of Buddha left its body, the earth shook and there was lightning and the gods Brahma and Indra appeared, and the latter exclaimed :

All things are unabiding
Birth, Death,—their Law ■ this;
They come to birth ; they perish.
End all, and that is bliss. ⁽³⁾

Three questions have been raised in this connection——
"Was Buddha a reality or a myth? what is the date of his death? and what did he die of?"

On the question of Buddha's reality there exists no doubt, though some little doubt was at one time thrown on his existence ⁽⁴⁾, on the authority of M. Senart who, however, only questioned his biography, though that fact has been used to support the conclusion that Buddha himself was the mere personification of an idea. And this is what M. Senart's ratiocination leads up to, though he himself acknowledges the existence of some person as Buddha—"as we see the reality of the church founded by him." But this admission itself becomes greatly weakened by the ratiocination that Buddhism is merely a religious development of the Sankhya system of Hindu philosophy and that the name of its alleged founder itself inwraps an allegory. But M. Senart's view was that from the one known fact that Buddha did exist, and nothing else being known, the fancy of his disciples have attached to his person the great allegorical ballad of the life of the Sun-god in human guise, when the life of the man Buddha had been forgotten. That the legendary life of the

(1) "Nirvan".

(2) *Po-we-Kian-King*.—Translated in *App. to the catalogue of Mss.* presented by the Japanese Government to the Secretary of State for India, and now in the India office. Concluding letter of Mr. Beal to Dr. Rost dated 1st September, 1874-85—*Hunter's Indian Empire*,

185, 186.

(3) *Mahaparinivvan*, VI—16.

(4) H. H. Wilson cited in *Hunter's Indian Empire* 199 f.n. assumed by Schellerns in his *Monumental Java* Ch. VII, 177-206, *contra* Oldenberg's *Buddhism* 72-73, 300. Weber (1878) *History, Ind.* Lit. 284—290.

founder of Buddhism is the embroidered fancy of a later race of his followers admits of no question. But the question is whether it is based upon the sub-stratum of facts, handed down as unquestioned events, in the life of the founder who had enlisted a large following in his life-time and had left him surviving a race of devout disciples deeply attached to him; and even if we suppose there be any doubt on this point, it still remains a question whether M. Senart's theory is not itself as fanciful as the biography he condemns.

Senart's theory rests on the dual meaning of certain words and the close affinity between Buddha's doctrine and Kapil's Sankhya philosophy. It is said that Buddhism owes its existence to the incentive of no single person, that it is merely a religious development of one system of Brahmanical philosophy; that the life is a mere personified allegory as is apparent from the names of its leading persons and places ⁽¹⁾. For instance, Gautam is an ancient Vedic sage, his other name being Bharadwaj; while another Gautam was the well-known propounder of the Nyay system of philosophy. His birth place at Kapilvastu only conveys its covert sense that it was "the abode of Kapil." His mother is called "Maya" in reference to the Maya Doctrine of Kapil and that his own name "Siddharth" ("He who has fulfilled the end") and Buddha ("the Enlightened") are significant and prove that the whole story of the birth, renunciation and the enlightenment, are reminiscent of the solar myth and of no historical personage. He recalls the fact that from the earliest age the allegorical poetry of the Indians, like that of the Greeks and the Germans, treats of the destinies of the Sun-god, of his birth from the morning-cloud, which as soon as it has given him being, must itself vanish before the rays of the illuminating child; of his battle with, and victory over, the dark demon of the thunder-cloud; of his triumphal march across the firmament; of his decline and disappearance into the darkness and nothingness.

Senart then adverts to what he calls the allegory of the

(1) Dr. E. J. Thomas referring to this subject in *Mind* (Oct. 1927) 495 doubts whether M. Senart still maintains the

hypothesis he published over fifty years ago.

life of **Buddh**: Like the Sun-god, **Buddh** issues from the clouds of night. He emerges from the dark womb "of a vision" and thus himself becomes visible; a flash of light pierces through the world when he is born; Maya dies as the morning cloud disappears before the rays of the Sun. As the Sun-hero is eclipsed by the thunderstorm but eventually vanquishes it, so does the demon Mar tempt **Buddh** by whom he is similarly vanquished; and, as in the contest in heaven, the thunder-storm first eclipses the Sun, so the tree which typifies the firmament with Mar as the thunder-demon, for a time shadows **Buddh**; but as the sun gains illumination, after the thunder-storm is vanquished, so **Buddh** obtains "enlightenment," after he had discomfited Mar, and as the Sun-god drives through the sky in his chariot, so **Buddh** proceeds to evangelize the world by setting in motion his "Wheel of Law."

And as towards sunset the clouds are tinted scarlet and obscure its light, against which it is powerless, so towards the evening of his life, **Buddh** is made to witness the annihilation of his whole house and his race, which he is powerless to prevent. And finally, as the Sun by his own rays, is quenched by the evening mist, so the flames of the funeral pile, on which **Buddh's** corpse is burnt, are extinguished by the streams of water which came pouring down from heaven. And as at last the Sun-god disappears in darkness and in nothingness, so does the mythical hero in Nirvan.

The theory is ingenious but far-fetched, and similar theories might be coined to explain away the notable events of many lives. Even more cogent reasons have recently been given to deny the reality of Jesus. Dr. Oldenberg,⁽¹⁾ Dr. Rhys Davids and other Pali scholars have combated M. Senart's scholarly, but unconvincing criticisms, by reference to the voluminous texts in which incidental references—all the more valuable because they are incidental,—recur to **Buddh** as a real personage. But the points which appear to be conclusive are the very ones which M. Senart has left unexplained. **Buddh** is mentioned as a contemporary ascetic teacher of Nirvan by Nataputta (Malahir).

(1) Oldenberg—*Buddhism* 72-94.

His reality is admitted even by the Brahmans who represent him as the ninth incarnation of Vishnu who had descended upon earth to mislead man. The site of Lambini garden where "portion of the ashes of Buddha was said to have been deposited," has since been identified, and the stupa which enclosed them found. M. Senart's whole theory that Kapilvastu is a fictitious name on the bank of Rohini has been falsified by recent archæological discoveries. That the life of Buddha is the life of a type, and not of a person—is greatly weakened by the fact that ascetics who follow a routine cannot be all fictitious entities. M. Senart bases his criticism on the legendary life depicted in the *Lalit Vistar*, which no one has yet supported as a historical document, not that it had no historical back-ground. The fictitious embellishment, which with the biographers of religious sages it is usual to add to the prosaic facts of their lives, does not make the lives themselves fictitious. Historical tradition of a real Buddha, the numerous circumstantial details of his life which are, not singly but cumulatively, evidence of their *verity*, are recorded in the scriptures of all schools. The theory that Buddha was the fictitious figurehead for the dissemination of Kapil's doctrines is disproved by no less an authority than Max Muller, who says: "We have looked in vain for any definite similarities between the system of Kapil, as known to us in the Sankhya Sutras and the Abhi Dharma or the metaphysics of Buddhists." ⁽¹⁾ Kapil's doctrines have been set out at length in the preceding pages and a comparison with his system or that of the Buddhists justifies Professor Max Muller's failure to find anything common between the two systems. What is then left in the biography to which the term fictitious can be safely applied? There is Mar, the God of Death, and Buddha's encounter with him under the *pipal* tree. That it typifies the mental struggle of a man who has been struggling to find a key to the problem of life is all that this episode can be held to prove. That such struggle is not unnatural, is not and cannot be denied. Lastly, that the earliest Buddhist books mention no less than 45 places which Buddha visited and in which he lived and preached his

(1) 1 *Chips from a German workshop* 226.

creed can have no mystic, allegorical significance. Persistent tradition from the earliest times, corroborated so far as it can be, by the existence of ancient memorials, is a sufficient and a safe voucher for the truth of the narrative of a life, the incidents of which there was no reason to invent in a mere allegory.

The question discussed by M. Senart was one of the questions which King Milinda had twice put to Nagsen⁽¹⁾ and to which Nagsen had given convincing replies. His argument was that as a complicated building required an architect, so a complicated system could not be without an author and that as his system is unique, so must be its designer. Milinda felt convinced and was converted to the new faith.

The fact that the biography of Buddha is vitiated by fable should not make us more fastidious or less indulgent towards the marvellous in Buddhism than we are towards the early periods of any other history. The main fact may be true, though the details are invented. And such evidence as is now available points to this conclusion. The fact that from the very dawn of Buddhism down to the present day, believers and non-believers have acted on the assumption of the reality of Buddha and the main incidents of his life which are inseparable from his personality, makes one pause before yielding to the suggestion that Buddha was merely a figure of speech. Long before his teachings were reduced to writing, the facts of his life and his teachings were carefully committed to the memory of men who were professional memorists of the sacred literature. They chanted them on all solemn occasions immediately on the decease of the Great Teacher. They thus imparted their knowledge from generation to generation. In so doing, there was just as much chance of interpolation as in any ancient writing, but there was scarcely any fear of a wholesale invention. The fact that from the very start the person of Buddha was mentioned as distinct from his precepts, and in the initiatory ceremony of a novice, upon his consecration he had to repeat three times

(1) *Questions of King Milinda*, III—5-1; 35 S. B. E. 109; *ib.* V—1; 36 ■ B. E. 206.

the formula—"I go for refuge to the Buddh : I go for refuge to the Law : I go for refuge to the Order" shows that every monk had to swear allegiance to the person of the Teacher before he could swear obedience to his precepts⁽¹⁾. The life of Buddh is far too circumstantial for a myth, far too chequered for a mere allegory.

The second question, when Buddh was born, is not free from difficulty. That he lived to the age of 80 or 81 is beyond dispute. But the question is, when was he born? or, what comes to the same thing, when did he die? According to the Chinese computation based upon portents, Buddh was born in 1,027 B. C. when, according to a work called *Chek-Shu-Yi-Ki*, a bright light of five colours was seen to pierce the constellation *Tai-Wei* and pass over the whole West. On seeing it, the historian Su Yen remarked that a great sage was born in the West. Eighty years later, a white rainbow was seen, having twelve stripes stretching from South to North. The historian Hu To seeing it, said: "It is the sign of the death of a great sage in the West." This date was and has been since, officially recognized as authentic⁽²⁾. But the traditional date, accepted by the earlier scholars, was 623-543 B.C. and is supported by the Ceylon tradition and chronicle. But four other dates have been suggested, ranging between 480 and 388. The former is the year to which Dr. Oldenberg is inclined. He says: "The year of his death is one of the most firmly fixed dates in ancient Indian history; calculations, by which the sum of possible error is confined within tolerably narrow limits, give as a result, that he died not long before or not long after 480 B.C."⁽³⁾. Sir A. Cunningham fixes it at 478; Rhys Davids at about 412, while Kern brings it down to 388. Other conjectures have been made, while on the other hand, the exact date of his death is calculated to be 1st June. The data upon which these calculations proceed appear to be all inconclusive at this distance of time; but the first date is as probable as any other; as Mr. Vincent Smith remarks, "I

(1) In its earlier stages the formula was "Come O Bhikkhu; well and ought is the doctrine; lead a holy life for the sake of the complete extinction of suffering."

—*Mahavagga* 1-6-34; 13 S. B. E. 99.

(2) Rev. J. Edkins; *Chinese Buddhism* (T. O. S.) 15, 16.

(3) Oldenberg; *Buddhism*, 196.

formerly accepted 487 or 486 B.C. as the best attested date, but the new reading of the Kharabela record pushes back all the earlier dates''⁽¹⁾. Prof. Max Muller gives reasons for his view that this period must be corrected to 537-477 B.C.⁽²⁾. On the whole, there is no well-attested data to justify the correction of the traditional date, supported by the very early high authority of the purest Buddhist chronicles available.

Hiuen Tsiang's memoirs are valuable for their antiquity and the details with which he fills up his pages of indiscriminate description. He was a pious pilgrim and records without criticism all that he saw and heard and could observe with his deeply devout vision.

Hiuen Tsiang records that according to the general tradition the Tathagat died at midnight of the 15th day of the second half of Baisakh⁽³⁾. Kashyap was then away, but Anurudh and Anand were present and spent the night in religious discourse. At dawn Anand went to the Mallas of Kushinagar and informed them of the Master's death. The Mallas were deeply grieved and collected their men, women and children, and taking with them five hundred suits of apparels, perfumes, garlands and musical instruments, proceeded to the Sal forest where the remains of the Tathagat lay. They spent there six days in paying their homage to the deceased and by singing hymns, dancing with music and with garlands and perfumes. They made canopies of their garments, and prepared decorative wreaths to hang thereon. On the second day, eight chieftains of the Mallas bathed their heads and clad themselves in new garments, preparatory to carrying the body for cremation. The Mallas decided to take it to the cremation-ground by the South gate; but when the pall-bearers tried to move the bier, it could not be moved. The Mallas were surprised, but Anurudh told them that the bier should be taken by the North gate through the town, to which the Mallas readily agreed. The bier was then carried in procession through the town. Meanwhile,

⁽¹⁾ V. Smith *History of India*, 52.

⁽²⁾ *Intro.—Dhammapad* 10 S. B. E. XLIII-XLVI. In the minor Rock Edict I it is stated that "this precept was proclaimed by the departed." 256 years have since elapsed which would bring

Buddh's death (if the edict refers to him) to 508 add 80. The year of his birth would then be 588 B.C. Asoka "*Rulers of India*," pp. 139, 140.

⁽³⁾ Beal *II Western Records*, 33.



(8) Indian Museum Relief from Yusufzai with Buddha's coffin.

Kashyap had hurried up from Pava to Kushinagar with 500 disciples to take part in the funeral. Amongst them was one Subhadda, a convert in his old age. Seeing the company lamenting and weeping, he said :—"Enough brethren ! weep not, neither lament ! we are well rid of the great Saman. We used to be annoyed by being told—'This beseems you, this beseems you not.' But we shall be able to do whatever we like ; and what we do not like, that we shall not have to do." But Kashyap consoled them in another way. He reminded them of the inexorable law of decay and dissolution. The four Malla chieftains then bathed their heads and donning new garments tried to set fire to the funeral pile, but it would not catch fire. Kashyap then walked reverently round the pile with his hands clasped and his head reverently bowing down ; and the 500 disciples did the same. The pile then took fire of itself ; and the Mallas removed the bones of the Blessed One to their own Council-hall where eight kings sent messengers to claim the relics, but eventually they were apportioned by agreement ⁽¹⁾. In his memoirs Hiuen Tsiang gives further details of the funeral scene. He says that on the Tathagat's death, men and Devas prepared a coffin made of the seven precious substances and in a thousand napkins swathed his body ; then spread both flowers and scents. They placed both canopies and coverings over it ; then the host of Mallas raised the bier and forward marched, with others following and leading on. Passing the golden river to the north, they filled the coffin up with scented oil, and piled high up the odorous wood and kindled it. Then after all was burnt, there were two napkins left—one that lay next the body, the other from the outside covering. Then they divided the *Shariras* (bodies) for the world's sake, the hair and nails alone remained untouched by fire. By the side of the place of cremation, there is a stupa : here Tathagat, for Kashyap's sake revealed his feet. When Tathagat was in his golden coffin, and oil poured on it and the wood piled up, the fire would not kindle. When all the beholders were filled with fear and doubt, Anurudh spoke : "We must await Kashyap." At this time Kashyap with 500 followers from out the forest came to Kushinagar and asked

(1) *Mahāparinirvāṇa* II S.B.E., 121—130

Anand, saying : " Can I behold the Tathagat's body ?" Anand said, " Swathed in a thousand napkins, enclosed within a heavy coffin, with scented wood piled up, we are about to burn it." At this time Buddh caused his feet to come from out the coffin. Above (or on) the wheel-sign, lo ! there were different coloured marks. Addressing Anand then he said, " And what are these ?" Answering he said, " When first he died, the tears of man and gods moved by pity, falling upon his feet, left these marks."

Kashyap walked round the corpse and worshipped it, after which the scented wood caught fire of its own accord and burnt the whole with a great conflagration. After his body had been consumed, the Mallas put out the fire with milk and enclosing the remains in a golden vase, they carried it to Kushinagar. But seven tribes appeared and claimed the relics, each one on the ground that the Blessed One belonged to them. Their claim was about to be asserted by use of force, when a Brahman,—Drone—intervened and settled the dispute by apportioning the relics amongst the eight claimants ⁽¹⁾ namely :—(1) The Kshatriyas of Kapilvastu, (2) of Vaisali, (3) of Buluka, (4) and of Roruka; (5) The Brahmins of Vethadvip, (6) The Kolias of Ramagram, (7) The Mallas of Kushinagar and (8) of Pava. The Tathagat is said to have returned to his disciples after three months of his death. As they were greatly worried at the Master's disappearance, Mandalyayan went up to the Tushit heaven and informed Buddh, who descended by a crystal staircase, accompanied by the Devas of Kamloke ⁽²⁾ and reassured his disciples of his continued interest in them. He also imparted to them further instructions. On his first re-appearance he put out his arms from the coffin and asked Anand—" Have you prepared the way ?"; on his second appearance he set up and preached the law for his mother's sake; and on his third appearance he showed his feet to the Great Kashyap ⁽³⁾.

That Buddh died a Chakravarti—a universal monarch, is symbolized in his stupas, the construction of which is

(1) R. D. 135; *Bulva*, 146, 147; *Biganelet*, II—95.

(2) *Bulva*, XI—308—315. Schiefner's

Tibetan Tales 227 ■ *seq. Rockhill; Life of Buddh*, 81.

(3) *11 Western Records*, 39, 40.

emblematical. The circular mound is designed to rest on a square plinth surrounded by a circular railing. The dome itself signifies the vault of heaven, and the world of space is signified by the Kshetra above Kshetra that rises from the Tee, ending in the symbol of the boundless empyrean, the three forked flame, trishul or the trident.

According to Tibetan Legends Buddh had nominated Kashyap as the head of the Order⁽¹⁾, but this was probably added to justify the pontifical authority of the Tibetan hierarchy, of which a later analogy is to be found in the statement of Jesus nominating Peter to be his proxy, upon which the Popes rest their authority⁽²⁾.

Of his disciples, Sariputra had predeceased Buddh by a year, having died at Naland. According to Hiuen Tsiang⁽³⁾ Kashyap outlived his Master 20 years; and after him Anand entered Nirvan on the bank of the Ganges, bequeathing half of his remains to Ajatshatru and the other half to the Licchavis of Vaishali who divided his body and interred it in Stupas at Pataliputra and Vaishali.

The third question is—what was the immediate cause of Buddh's death? It is stated on the authority of Rhys Davids' mis-translation of the *Pari Nirvan* that "he who had preached Ahimsa (non-killing) died of a surfeit of pork." Now what are the facts? In the first place, are we sure that what the Perfect One ate as his last meal was "dried pork" at all? The word used in the *Maha Parinirvan* is either *Shukkar* or "*Shukra Madhav*;"⁽⁴⁾—the latter has no reference to either a pig or boar or its drying—the only food it suggests is some compressed sweet dish made of, or containing honey. Professor Rhys Davids who translated it as "dried boar's flesh" in his translation of that Sutra⁽⁵⁾ has since confessed his mistake,

(1) *Tibetan Legends*, 155.

(2) *Math.* XVI—18.

(3) See Bibliography for references to works of the two countries.

(4) See 3 Wheeler's *History of India* 141, 142.

(5) *Shukar*—means a pig; but "*Shukra*" has various meanings. It means *pure*, *bright*. Hence the planet Venus or "Fire". It also means the essence of

anything e.g., male and female energy; the marrow of bones. Its other meanings are: name of a plant *chitrak*, peacock, while in the Vedas it is used to denote water. *Madhava* is the Pali of Sk. *Madhav*. *Madhu*—honey; *Madhav*—sweets made of honey, a sweet dish. According to the *Pali Dictionary* (by Ryn. Davids) it means mild, gentle, soft, suave. (See its pp. 142, 143.)

for in his note to his translation of "The questions of King Milinda," assuming the word to be *Shukar Maṭṭhava*, he says: "There is great doubt as to the exact meaning of this name of the last dish the Buddha partook of. *Maṭṭhati* is 'to rule, or 'to press', or 'to trample' and just as 'pressed beef' is ambiguous, so is 'boar-pressed' or 'pork-tender' capable of various interpretations.....It means, I think, 'meat pervaded by the tenderness and niceness of boar's (flesh).' But that is itself ambiguous and *Dhammapaḍa* adds that "Others say the word means, not pork or meat at all, but the 'tender top sprout of the bamboo plant after it has been trampled upon by swine,' Others say again, that it means a kind of mushroom that grows in ground trodden under foot by swine. Others again, that it means only a particular kind of flavouring or sauce. As *maṭṭhana* is rendered by Childers 'withered,' I have translated it in my 'Buddhist Sutras' (pp. 71—73) 'dried boar's flesh.' But the fact is that the exact sense is not known." (1) It is submitted that "*Maṭṭhav*" is the Pali corruption of "*Maṭṭhav*" which means "comprising *Maṭṭhu*." "*Maṭṭhu*," of course, means "honey," while "*Shukar*" is probably also the popular corruption of *Shukra* and may mean anything white, pure, or compressed, but it does not mean a pig, but even if the word were "*Shukar*" it might still be—as Prof. Rhys Davids admits that it may just as well mean—"withered flowers" or "tender flowers." And in his translation of *Diḅh Nikai*; translated as "Dialogues of the Buddha" (2) the same author translates it as "truffles" and in a foot note adds more decisively that the dish was made from "bulbous roots, a sort of truffles found in the jungles and called *Sukara Kandā*." He adds: "It is perhaps of importance that the food prepared by Chanda and eaten by Buddha is called *Bhatta*: this is not used elsewhere of meat. The fact is, it is the only place where that word occurs, and *Shukar Maṭṭhav* even at its worst cannot mean 'sweets made of pork' but those 'beloved of pork', ■ term applied to edible mushrooms devoured by pigs, as truffles are by the boars in Europe."

(1) 35 S.B.E. 244 f.n. (1).

(2) 3 S. B. E. 137.

Those who assume that Buddha died of a surfeit of pork have, therefore, no sure ground for their assertion. On the other hand, the probabilities are that the dish offered to Buddha was some special dish made out of sweet and honey and fruit. It was the one question of King Milinda to Nagsen in which he refers to the dish as "of great fruit" and asks: "The people are in bewilderment about this, thinking that the dysentery must have been caused by his eating too much out of greediness." To this Nagsen replied that the sickness was due to his enfeebled constitution more than to the food taken⁽¹⁾; or as we should now say, because the food carried to his bowels the amæba germs of dysentery.

Even if the fact were otherwise, the position is not different.

The Blessed One had already decided that his disciples were free to eat meat; but it must not have been killed for their food. He had prohibited the taking of life; but had never made an ordinance that his disciples shall never take meat at all. On the other hand, they had taken it on previous occasions. But on the day when Buddha partook of the dried venison, he had warned his disciples against taking it. He knew it was poisonous, but nevertheless he took it, because his disciple had laid it before him. He warned Chanda that it was poisonous and had it buried. Surely, in the face of these facts, no one can accuse Buddha of gluttony. It is true that he did at times indulge in excess of food; this is admitted by himself. For, addressing Udayan, he said: "Be not remiss as to the rules (to be observed). Be restrained in (matters relating to) the stomach.... Now there were several days, Udayan, on which I ate out of this bowl when it was full to the brim, and ate even more." ⁽²⁾ In fact there appear to be occasions when he suffered on that account, and it is on record that he was once treated for it by the celebrated physician Jiwak Kumarbhaksh. ⁽³⁾ But in the present case, if the text be read as a whole, Buddha knew before he touched his food, that it was infected and otherwise unfit for human consumption. His forbade its service to the

(1) *Milinda*, IV—3-21-23; ■ S. B. E. No. 77) quoted in *Milinda* IV—5-4; ■ 242-248. S. B. E. 4.

(2) *Maha Udayi Sutta (Madhyam Nikai* ■ *Mahavagga VIII—I-30*; 17 S. B. E. 191.

disciples. He, however, took it because he could not refuse what his host had out of a loving heart prepared for his meal. It ■ true that boar-hunt is a favourite sport of the Kshatriyas and Ram delighted in it. But Buddha, though a Kshatriya, had given up this pastime. He was for taking no life. There is no inconsistency between his precept and his practice. He had a prescience of his coming end, and he was prepared for it. Chanda's feast did certainly hasten his end. He thought he had yet three more months to live. He expected that death would overtake him after the rains. It did surprise him to that extent,—if the narrative which gives no dates be held to recount the facts in quick succession.

The record of no man's life can be complete without some reference to his character. And the character of the Saviour is the indelible adjunct of his work.

It is the true index of his mind. And in order to reach the nearest approximation to truth, it must be inferred not so much from his precepts or the opinions of his contemporaries as from his well-proven acts. Of these, there are several which furnish the surest criteria to his character. The first and foremost feeling in the Saviour's mind was one of deep compassion towards all sentient life. It is the keynote of his life: the master key to his character. Early in life, "lured by love of the wood and longing for the beauties of the ground, he went to a spot near at hand on the forest outskirts; and there he saw a piece of bed being ploughed, with the path of the plough broken like waves on the water. Having beheld the ground in this condition, with its young grass scattered and torn by the plough, and covered with the eggs and young of little insects which were killed, he was filled with deep sorrow as for the slaughter of his own kindred. And beholding the men as they were ploughing, their complexions spoiled by the dust, the sun's rays, and the wind, and their cattle bewildered with the burden of drawing, the most Noble One felt extreme compassion. Having alighted from the back of his horse, he went over the ground slowly, overcome with sorrow, pondering the birth and destruction

of the world, grieved and exclaimed, "this is, indeed, pitiable."⁽¹⁾

Though Gautam had an insuperable contempt for human life because it was so precarious and fraught with misery, he did not feel the same contempt for natural scenery. On the other hand, his whole life shows him to have been a lover of Nature and extremely susceptible to its beauties. Even when his mind was oscillating with doubt as to the end of his mission, he had not forgotten to select a site for meditation, which, with its sylvan solitude and gliding streams running along the spacious plain dotted by shady groves of arborous trees and fertile fields, seemed an ideal place for meditation and repose. "There" he says, "I thought to myself, truly this is a pleasant spot and a beautiful forest. Clear flows the river and pleasant are the bathing places: all around are meadows and villages⁽²⁾."

Such was Uruvela—a place close to Gaya, situate on the bank of the river now called the Phalgu or the Lilanja, formerly known as the Niranjan. It is now banked with masonry steps and bathing ghats with numerous temples, but in Buddh's days it must have been an ideal place for mental repose and inspiration which Gautam felt, an influence alike calming to the senses and stimulating to the mind⁽³⁾. Buddh invariably selected such sylvan retreats for his rainy camps; and his love of nature and personal beauty, pervading through all his speeches and discourses, unmistakably proves the trend of his æsthetic mind. It is indeed an inspiration which has descended to his disciples who have everywhere selected for their *Vihars* and temples, stupas and shrines, the most charming upland hills and mountains available in the neighbourhood. To him Nature and Truth were one and immutable and inseparable as beauty and love. To him the open life under the broad canopy of heaven in a mango, bamboo or sal grove on a

(1) *Buddh-Charitra* V—5-7: 49 S.B.E.
30.

(2) *Lalit Vistara*, 85.

(3) Elliott's *I Hinduism and Buddhism*,
137.

hill-side, watered by a flowing stream, was the only tonic he needed for his divine vision.

This was early, very early in life. It is invidious to institute comparisons between master-teachers of the world, the more so, as one cannot always be sure that faith may not in some cases warp one's judgment. But such comparisons have been made and one is constrained to refer to them. In his work on Buddhism, Dr. Oldenberg has permitted himself to say: "I am not aware of any instance in which a Chandal—the Pariah of that age—is mentioned in the sacred writings as a member of the Order. For the lower order of the people, for those born in toil, in manual labour, hardened by the struggle for existence, the announcement of the connection of misery with all forms of existence was not made, nor was the dialectic of the law of the painful concatenation of causes and effects calculated to satisfy 'the poor in spirit.' 'To the wise belongeth this law,' it is said, 'not the foolish.'" Very unlike the word of that Man who suffered 'little children to come unto him; for of such is the kingdom of God,' for children and those who are like children, the arms of Buddh are not opened⁽¹⁾." That this is not a singular criticism is clear from the comments of other writers⁽²⁾, to whom the above quotation furnishes the completest answer. Buddh was no doubt an aristocratic hermit; but his ideas were not those of an aristocrat. He was not only compassionate to the low and lowly, but even to the meanest object in the Creation. It is said that there is not a single instance in which a Chandal is mentioned as a member of the Order. Now if this were a fact, it would not support the inference; since while Buddhism was open to all, it is not every Chandal that would understand its tenets; and Chandals of all countries are notoriously ignorant and indifferent to the impact of religion.

But it is not a fact that no Chandal is mentioned as a member of the Order. On the other hand, we have an instance of a Chandal

(1) *Buddhism* 157, 158.

(2) Cf. M. Williams *Buddhism*, 555, 556;

being mentioned even as a Bhikkhu by name⁽¹⁾ who had been a "vulture trainer" and was, therefore, unquestionably a Chandala⁽²⁾. He became an apostate, and being recalcitrant, was set before Buddha, who explained to him the doctrine and rebuked him for his apostacy. But apart from the Order of the monks, there are several instances of the outcasts being admitted into his fold, and that during its early stages, when such admissions must have affronted the high-born. Dr. Oldenberg himself qualifies his textual statement in his own note, adding, "By this it is not meant to imply that people of humble origin in no case appear in the old texts as members of the Order⁽³⁾." He quotes the instance of a sweeper, to which might be added those of bad women who were openly received into the Order and with whom the Lord himself dined. References have already been made to them, and Dr. Oldenberg himself mentions that fact⁽⁴⁾.

The charge, therefore, made against Buddha that his sympathy was limited to the high-born is contradicted by facts. On the other hand, his sympathy was universal and his kindness was not merely confined to little children, but extended in an equal degree to little insects in the field. In fact, his whole doctrine is a doctrine of compassion, and whether one agrees with it or not, it is a doctrine intended to bring some relief to pitiful humanity who suffer and die.

Consequently, no man has ever been more unjustly attacked than when Buddha was compared to Christ, and the one was shown to be kindly and the other indifferent. Christ helped his fishermen to catch a netful of fish to be killed and eaten. He prayed to the Almighty to fill his disciples' nets. Buddha had rigidly prohibited the taking of life. His Order was the Order founded for the purpose of bringing some peace and hope to all sentient life.

(1) His name was *Arisht* (*Arishtha*)—*Kullvagg* 1.32.1; 17 S.B.E. 377-381 and see f.n.

(2) See Bys. Davids' *Buddhist India*,—54.

(3) *Buddhism*, 157 f.n.

(4) *Ib.* p. 148.

individual exertion, been the means of allaying human suffering and adding to human happiness, by heightening and ennobling his character and purging and purifying his mind. Buddha's contribution to the world-happiness must be judged, not only by what he taught but also by how its teachings had completely transformed society. He was abstemious and enjoined rigid abstinence on all his disciples. He exalted poverty in the clergy as its prime necessity. His own progression from village to village on foot, bowl in hand, was an outward expression of his inner mind. He believed that those who taught religion must not make it a living. He would permit no storage of grain or food, no collection of any supplies for his monks' animal wants. It is an ideal which later ages followed, even when they did not follow his dogma. He taught people the dignity of labour and showed it by his own example. He brought into the market-place the divine elements of virtue, patience, equanimity of temper and returning good for evil.

Throughout his life he was hounded by his own cousin, who made alliance with any one willing to humiliate him. But he never retaliated, and in the course of his long life, he not only taught but showed by his example the mental satisfaction that comes from the subjugation of evil passions and the display of generosity, magnanimity and charity. Even when a murderous plot exposed him to the cruel presence of death at the foot of a mad elephant, he was calm and collected. Even when he was tormented by the thought of the despoliation of his home, he could not be moved to retaliation. And above all, in his love for humanity, and what is more, for his equal love for all sentient life, he brought into vivid light the unity of all life, and his great kindness to the dumb creation was translated by his followers, who provided for the treatment of suffering animals. These were the first veterinary hospitals, which extended the benevolent scope of hospitals to all alike—man or beast. He taught man the value of self-realization by instituting public confessions for "Disburdenment" of sins. And as he lived, so he

died—calm, composed, collected in thought, clear in his expressions, cheerful in his resignation—a man the like of whom the world has never seen.

Though Buddha had never claimed to be anything more than a man, his death sufficed to exalt him to the rank of a God, to whom prayers might be offered. His apotheosis was claimed by two wholly independent creeds, though in an opposite sense. The Hindus regarded him as the ninth, and therefore the last, incarnation of Vishnu, "the lying spirit descended to deceive the world until the advent of his truth and final incarnation who would appear on a white horse with a flaming sword, like a comet in the land, for the destruction of the wicked and the renovation of the world." But after the dethronement of Buddhism later Brahmanical writers began to perceive Buddhism in its true perspective. Thus in Gitgobind: "Victory to Thee, O Hari, Lord of the world, O Keshav, who hast assumed the bodily form of Buddha, and out of compassionate heart forbiddest sacrifices in which the doomed animals are killed!" And the Christian church canonized him as a saint under the name of Josaphat, which is only a corruption of Bodhisatv, to whom a day has been assigned both by the Greek and Roman churches ⁽¹⁾ and to whom a church was dedicated at Palerus ⁽²⁾, and whose influence upon the apostolic Christianity was so marked and striking that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the tenets and practice of the one were the pattern and prototype of the other. "It is difficult to enter a Japanese Buddhist temple without being struck by analogies to the Christian ritual on the one hand, and to Hinduism on the other. The chanting of the priests, their bowing as they pass the altar, their vestments, rosaries, bells, incense, and the responses of the worshippers remind one of the Christian ritual."⁽³⁾ And it is not in ritual alone that Buddhism has influenced Christianity. As will be seen later, the analogy goes deeper, down to the cardinal doctrines of Christianity and to the very words of its Founder.

(1) Max Muller—*4 Chips from a German workshop*, 177-189.

(2) Hunter's *Indian Empire*, 196, 197.
(3) *Ib.* 197.

CHAPTER VIII.

LEGENDARY LIFE OF BUDDH.

The legendary life of Buddha is contained in two works—the *Lalit Vistara* and the *Buddh Charitra* of Ashwaghosh⁽¹⁾. Apart from the few historical facts already referred to in the preceding pages, these works have no value except to the devout, for whom they were composed. It is not, therefore, proposed to recount their details here beyond indicating their general trend, to enable the curious to see how the simple life of a great man suffers from the adulation of his worshippers. The *Lalit Vistara* commences with the life of Gautam as Bodhisatv in the Tushit heaven where he is worshipped by countless gods and nymphs to whom he preaches the law. He then decided to descend to the earth after a period of twelve years. His advent was heralded by the gods coming down to the earth to instruct the Brahmans and inform the Pratyek-Buddhs of the impending arrival of Buddha. He decided to adorn the house of Shuddhodhan, as he was then a virtuous king with a queen Maya, who was free from all deceit and possessed of effulgence and splendour like the splendour of the sun. Before leaving the heaven he summoned to audience all the gods and in their presence placed his golden crown on the Maitreya, appointing him his successor. The gods wept and clasping the feet of the Bodhisatv said, "This dwelling of Tushit, O Noble One, when thou art departed, will not shine any more." The Bodhisatv consoled them, adding that the Maitreya he was leaving behind, would instruct them in the law. He then in the month of Baishakh⁽²⁾ assumed "the form of a huge elephant, white like Himalaya, armed with six tusks: with his face perfumed with flowing ichor, entered the womb of the queen of King Shuddhodhan to destroy the evils of the world"⁽³⁾.

(1) 49 S.B.E., 1—207.

(2) L.V., 14.

(3) *Buddh Charitra*—49, S.B.E. 1—20, 4.



(9) Sarnath, Benares, Slab illustrating scenes from Buddha's life.

He had then in attendance a hundred thousand million Kotis of gods and Yakshas from the beautiful Tushit abode. "Without being touched, hundreds of thousands of million Kotis of divine and human music-instruments offered sweet sounds. A hundred thousand ten thousand Kotis of gods bore the great pavilion on their hands, their shoulders and heads. And the hundred thousands of Apsaras, every one making her own music, placed themselves in front, behind, left and right of the Bodhisatv, praising him with the melody of their harmonious songs."⁽¹⁾ "In the mother when the entering of the womb has taken place, there appears directly on the right side a ratnavyuh-pavilion," and in that pavilion remains the Bodhisatv sitting with legs crossed. For the body of the Bodhisatv in his latest existence has not the nature of the fleshly substance of a foetus, but he appears seated complete with all his limbs and parts of limbs and with all the requisite tokens.

The queen then sent for the king in the Ashoke wood, whither he had repaired. He tried to enter her presence, but found his body too heavy to carry him. He bowed with reverence and appearing before his queen, asked her why he had been summoned. The queen told him of her dream in which the elephant had entered her womb and asked him to consult the Brahmans what it meant. The latter told her that she would be the mother of Buddh, the Saviour of the world. The king was exercised in his mind what preparation to make to give the saviour a fitting reception; but the four great kings approached him and promised to prepare a house for the Bodhisatv. Then came Chakra, the King of the Gods, and he promised to give the Bodhisatv a dwelling like that of Vaijayant. Then in the great city of Kapil all the Kamvakar-rulers of the Gods each built a palace in honour of the Bodhisatv; and Shuhddodhan also prepared a palace excelling all human dwellings. "While the Bodhisatv remained in the womb, he continued to be on the right side, sitting with legs crossed." And all those who were possessed by a God, Nag, Yaksh, Gandharv, Asur, Garud or Bhut,—men, women, boys or

(1) L. V., 14.

girls, when they saw the queen, recovered their senses and got back their memory, and those who had lost their human shape recovered it on the spot ; and those who were suffering, became whole and healthy.

Now when ten months had passed in this way and the time for the Bodhisatv's birth was come, there appeared in the palace and the park of King Suddhodhan two and thirty omens.....From the slopes of the Himalaya came young lions continually, and after passing round the excellent city named Kapil, with rejoiced greetings, keeping the city on their right, they lay down on the thresholds of the gates without doing harm to any one. Five hundred young white elephants came and saluted King Shuddhodhan's feet with the end of their trunks. Children of the gods, with girdles round their waists, appeared in King Shuddhodhan's private apartments and seated themselves on the lap of first the one and then another''⁽¹⁾.

In the spring when the queen felt that her time for delivery had approached, she started for her pleasure-garden, accompanied by 84,000 horse-carriages decorated with all sorts of ornaments and by 84,000 elephant carriages decorated with all sorts of ornaments, escorted by 84,000 warriors, brave, warlike, well-favoured, handsome, clad in mail and armour, followed by 60,000 Shakya women, guarded by 40,000 Shakyas of the family of King Shuddhodhan, old, young and middle-aged accompanied by 60,000 persons of King Shuddhodhan's private apartments, who made harmonious music, consisting of singing and the sound of all sorts of instruments, surrounded by 84,000 gods' daughters, 84,000 Nag-daughters, 84,000 Gandharv-daughters, 84,000 Kinnar-daughters, and 84,000 Asur-daughters, adorned with differently composed ornaments who sang all kinds of songs of praise⁽²⁾. On the day appointed for the advent of the Bodhisatv, Maya went into the garden and selected a great *palash* tree which bowed to salute her. Ten million Apsaras of the Kamvakar gods descended to form a train to serve Queen Maya.

(1) L. V., 28.

(2) L. V., 330.

The Bodhisatv then came out of his mother's right side in possession of memory and knowledge, unsullied by the impurity of the mother's womb. Without any man's help he took seven steps to the East and said: "Behold I shall be the first of all Dharmas who are the roots of salvation."

The gods of heaven bathed the newly born Bodhisatv and sprinkled him with blossoms; fly-whisks appeared in the air, and an umbrella adorned with jewels. And as he walked, the divine-white large umbrella and the two magnificent fans moved above him in the air unsupported. At every spot where the Bodhisatv set his foot, lotuses sprung up "When he was born, the earth, though fastened down by the Himalaya, the monarch of mountains, shook like a ship tossed by the wind; and from a cloudless sky there fell a shower full of lotuses and waterlilies, and perfumed with sandal-wood."⁽¹⁾ Seven days after his birth, his mother died to be born again among the three and thirty gods. Thereupon 500 Shakya women vied with one another to act as his foster-mother. But the honour fell to her sister Mahaprajapati Gautami.

As was the custom, Shuddhodhan took his infant son to be presented to the gods of the family temple. But no sooner had the king with the prince crossed its threshold, all the gods within stood up in a body assuming their real forms and threw themselves at the feet of the Bodhisatv. Other miracles followed; and so the young prince grew up till he was entered in the school. But as soon as the school-master Vishvamitra saw him, he fell with his face to the ground, for the majesty and radiance of the Bodhisatv was greater than he could bear. The Bodhisatv then questioned him what language he wanted him to learn, Brahmi or Kharostī. The school-master was dazed at the precocity of his pupil who knew more than his teacher, but had nevertheless deigned to come to the children's school.

(1) *Buddh Charitra*, 49, S.B.E., I—40, 7

When he had passed the period of childhood and reached that of middle youth, the king remembered the prophecy that the prince would either become a Buddha or the Universal Monarch. He, therefore, wished to divert his mind to sensual pleasures; and opened negotiations for his marriage, which was preceded by a tournament in which the victor was to obtain the prize of a bride: Gautam beat all his competitors and won his bride who happened to be his own cousin—Gopi.

Gautam was reflective, but had not yet left his home; because the time was not yet. When it arrived the God Haridev, son of the God Tushitkayik, followed by 32,000 gods' sons came into the palace and spake thus: "What death is, has been set forth O Radiant One; and what birth is, has been expounded, O Lion amongst men. In giving instruction to the women's apartment, thou hast followed the custom of the world. Many in the world of gods and men have become ripe and have attained the Law. The time is now come; consider well thy resolve to depart." The sight of old age, disease and death hastened his decision. And on the appointed day as he left his home, the earth shook and became bestrewn with flowers, the air was filled with music and gods and Asurs praised him. For six years he followed the usual course of severe asceticism and self-denial which reduced him to a skeleton. Thereupon the gods' sons came to him and said: "Most Noble Being, thou needest not partake of such abundance of food; we will infuse the strength thereof through thy pores." But the Bodhisatv refused this offer, saying to himself that it would be a lie to feed through the pores when he had vowed to abstain eating through the mouth. This brought on extreme emaciation which reached the ears of Maya Devi in heaven.

Indeed, some of the gods seeing him in this condition, even thought that he was dead, and they conveyed these tidings to her. Maya Devi immediately descended to the bank of the Niranjana, where Gautam had his abode, and visiting him at midnight and finding his body withered, and himself lying like one dead, she began to cry; but the Bodhisatv



(10) The Ascetic Gautam.



(11) Indian Museum Buddh seated in earth touching attitude—from Magadh (Medieval).

consoled her saying, "Fear not for love of thy son ; thou shalt pluck the fruit of thy labour. Not in vain doth a Buddh renounce the world. I shall fulfil the prophecy of Asit and make plain the prediction of Dipangkar ; though the earth should fall into a hundred fragments, and Meru droop with his radiant brow into the waters, though the sun, the moon and stars should be smitten to the ground, yet I, the only human being, should not die. Therefore, be not sorrowful, for soon wilt thou behold the wisdom of a Buddh" (1).

After six years of penance his russet garments got tattered. A son of the Shuddhvas-Kayik gods offered him a russet garment which he accepted. And when he decided to resume the taking of his ordinary diet, the gods of Uruvela deputed Sujata, daughter of the village Chief, Nandik, to get ready milk and rice in a golden bowl which the Bodhisatv partook of in her house. Having taken the food, he wished to return the golden bowl but Sujata said, "I will give no one food without the bowl." He returned with the bowl and wanted to take a bath in the river Niranjana which the gods filled with divine perfume and after taking his bath, he threw the golden bowl into the river. The Nag King, Kallik, removed it to heaven where he built a stup thereon to adore it. Gautam then selected a tree under which he spread grass and sat thereon, uttering the following vow : "May my body wither on this seat, my skin, bones and flesh decay ; until I have attained the wisdom so hard to attain in many æons, my body shall not be moved from this seat." He then reflected : "Here in the Kingdom of desire, Mar, the Evil One, is Lord and Ruler ; it would not become me to attain the highest and most perfect wisdom without his knowledge. Let me then provoke Mar, the Evil One."

Mar got ready for his on-slaught. He prepared terrible weapons with which to fight Gautam. But the latter reminded him of his millions of lives and sacrifices therein, and touched the Earth saying, "I appeal to this mother of creatures, O Evil One." As soon as she was touched, this mighty earth

(1) *Lalit Vistara*, 86.

trembled in six manners; and the goddess of the Earth, Sthavira, appeared surrounded by hundred Kotis of Earth-goddesses and bowing to the Bodhisatv spake, "It is so, Great Being, it is so as thou hast declared, we are all witnesses thereof." Mar then tried the art of seduction and deputed his daughters to inveigle him by their allurements; but he was firm as the king of the mountains. Mar fell back helpless; and in the late watch of that night, as the day began to break, there dawned upon him the threefold knowledge. Thereupon the gods spake, "Strew flowers, O friends, Bhagwan hath attained the wisdom." Then the gods strewed divine flowers over the Tathagat till a knee deep layer of the blossoms was formed."

Gautam now became Buddh and all the Buddhs rejoiced and sent him umbrellas made of precious stones to shade him. He remained there a week more in contemplation; after which the Kamvakar gods' sons took ten thousand vases of perfumed water and bathed him. There was a concourse of other gods. He remained there three more weeks; in the second, he took a long walk that included the complex of the 3,000 great thousands of worlds. In the third week, he took a short walk for the distance that is between the East and the West Sea. The fourth week, he spent in a Jewel House made by the gods. In the fifth week, he stayed in the dwelling of the Nag King, Muslind, who protected him with his hood. In the sixth week, the Tathagat went away from the dwelling of Muslind to the banyan tree of the goat-herds.

Then the four guardians of the world offered him four golden bowls, which he declined. They then offered silver bowls, which he also declined. Then thought the Tathagat, "In what kind of bowl was food received by the former Tathagats?" "In stone bowls," he remembered. The four kings offered him four stone bowls, but he needed only one. He did not, however, like to displease the other three. So he accepted all and made them into one.

Then the great Brahm came to request him to reveal the Law. He touched his feet in reverence and made the

request. The Tathagat yielded and said that he would do so. He then went to Benares where he preached his first sermon, which closes the life as depicted in the *Lalit Vistar*.

Asvaghosh, who borrowed his narrative from that work, carried it to his return home. But his narrative is throughout embellished with a similar account of the gods, Jins and Asurs, who flocked from worlds innumerable, to listen to his discourse, made clouds to shelter him, rain to cool him and poured perfume to regale him ; while he, on his part, performed numerous miracles of which the following is an example. He wanted to wash himself. So Shakra dug out a great river full of water and four stones were brought to him by the four Mahorags. He sat on one, washed on the other, dried on the third " and another he flung up in the sky ; the stone as it flew up reached the blazing city and astonished all the worlds."

Later books have embroidered his life with equally wild and unvaried imagery.

CHAPTER IX.

LATER DEVELOPMENTS.

The Buddhistic Order was a religious republic : it knew of no hierarchy. Every member of the order was equal and equally free to work out his own salvation. Buddha had instituted the Order of monks and nuns, but he provided no graded service of his disciples. The clergy were all sworn to celibacy, the lay brethren were free to marry and follow their ordinary pursuits. He had nominated no successor ; he had provided for no means of his election or appointment. He had entrusted the Sangh—the congregation of monks—to uphold and disseminate his doctrine. When he started his missionary career, he was all alone. Even the five disciples who had come to him during his period of reflection and preparation had deserted him. They rejoined him and their number soon swelled into hundreds and then to thousands, so that when Buddha died, his religion had become a national religion in all *Aryavart*, that is, in what is now Northern India. It had percolated to the South, but north of the Ganges it had attained the pre-eminence of a paramount religion. Buddha was no mean judge of men. He had freely mixed with the people and he knew too well their predominant love of display and zest for power. He entrusted his creed to the collective wisdom of his congregation. If he had been a lesser man, the inclination of his mind would have impelled him to nominate his faithful Anand, who had ever stood loyally by him and whose influence in the country was only second to his own, to the headship of his Church.

But though Buddha had designated no successor, he had left a large number of disciples, who had become graded amongst themselves, as “chief disciples”⁽¹⁾ or “great disciples”⁽²⁾, according to their qualifications—of the latter, there were eighty, and of these sixteen or more ranked as

(1) “ *Agra-Shravak* ” (Sk. *Agra*—foremost leaders, *Shravak*—disciples).

(2) “ *Maha-Shravak* ” (Sk. *Maha*—great. *Shravak*—disciples).

chiefs. Some of his chief disciples—e.g., Sariputra and Mandgalyan (*Moggallana*) had predeceased the Master; but amongst those who survived him were his two cousins Anand and Anurudh, Kashyap and Katyayan, to whom on a later date two more, Khema and Uppalvaru (*Uppala-Vanna*) were added. These chief disciples became afterwards known as *Sthavirs* or *Mahasthavirs*. But these and others, though entitled to consideration on account of their age, experience or learning, had no recognised status or position of authority in the brotherhood. Even in its later development which settled the rules of the clergy, the constitution was still democratic and all disciples always remained on the same level of equality. But later on, as the religion became international, each Sangh or congregation developed its own individuality and became more and more self-contained, ending in the Sanghs becoming wholly independent organizations, each one with an elected Head of its own.

But such world-wide development Buddha never expected, and he never provided for its control. In fact, the system which he had originated was in reality not a religious system. It will be seen later, how religious ideas developed long after his time. To him the problems which had baffled the Vedic sages were too abstruse and theoretical. He never disclosed what his views were about God—whether He was personal, or a World-spirit, and to what extent, if at all, He governed the Universe. But he did not ignore that supreme problem. His views, or rather the views of his religion on the subject, have given occasion to its critics for denouncing his religion as declaredly atheistic. It is not so. There is more plausibility in the view that "Buddhism declares itself ignorant of any mode of personal existence, compatible with the idea of spiritual perfection, and so far it is ignorant of God".⁽¹⁾ Nor did he apply his mind to the ultimate destiny of man and its relation to individual consciousness, and his earliest view of Nirvan was no more than the enjoyment of a state of rest, consequent on the extinction of all causes of sorrow.⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾ Beal—*Catena of Buddhist scriptures*
—153.

⁽²⁾ *Ib.*—157.

His main objective was to mitigate, if he could not eliminate, human suffering. As such, all his work, all his teachings were centred upon the practice of virtue. As such, Buddha was, first and foremost, the greatest of humanitarians, the first to fathom the true cause of human suffering and the first to offer a solution for its alleviation. He did not consider that the practice of virtue was incompatible with the highest ethics of any religion; and consequently he did not launch any frontal attack upon the existing religion—except so far as that religion countered his ethics. It was not, therefore, necessary for him to provide for the formation of any organization beyond what was germane to his purpose. In his farewell exhortation he adverted to the necessity of a successor: "It may be, Anand", he said, "that in some of you, thought may arise—the words of our Teacher are ended; we have lost our Master. But it is not thus. The truths and the rules of the Order, which I have taught and preached, let these be your Teacher, when I am gone".⁽¹⁾ These parting words shew clearly the bent of his mind. In making his congregation the joint executors of his religious testament, he adopted a course at variance with both precedents and practice. For he knew that a religious order, as much as a political power, required a head to control its members. But he equally foresaw the danger of adopting such a course. He, therefore, appointed his Order the custodians of his doctrine. That doctrine had been imparted to them by word of mouth. Its principles had been broadcasted by him in Sanghs, open debates and popular lectures. He had made sure that its principles were intelligible to the meanest intelligence. To him they were simple; or rather it is to simplify them that he had consecrated his life and spent six years in deep reflection. He had reduced his tenets to a simple syllogism: where there is life, there is pain; the latter was the inseparable incident of the other: that pain could only end with death and not with death alone; it will return with returning life. How then to eliminate it?—by uprooting its main trunk which lay embedded in selfishness.

(1) *Mahāparinirvāṇa*, VI—1.

A selfless life was, therefore, his ideal: it was his goal. The theatre for the display of selfishness was the world, its stage was the arena for Buddhism. The Buddhist must in his thought, action and conduct show that he had eradicated all selfishness from his nature. He must prove to himself, by introspection and public confessions of his sins, how far he had progressed towards his appointed goal. The Master had left an example for all world to follow.

Unlike the founders of other great religions who succeeded him, Buddha was himself a highly educated man. But, nevertheless, he never reduced his system to a treatise. He trusted to oral instruction and exposition of his views. The reason for this is obvious. The Vedas being alleged to be inspired, being in fact,—as Sayan claimed, the very breath of Brahm, not only as to the matter but also as to the alphabet, language and its grammar, they had to be reduced to writing and as the Sanskrit script and vocabulary had long since been settled, they were committed to writing and so were their philosophic treatises from which Buddha imbibed his religious knowledge. He counted amongst his disciples some of the most learned Brahman preceptors of the time, the natural inclination of whose mind would be to follow the practice of their forebears and reduce the Master's teaching to writing. But nevertheless it was never done during Buddha's lifetime and not for a thousand years thereafter. So far as Buddha himself is concerned, there appears to be a very good reason why nothing was committed to writing. Buddha did not wish to crystallize his doctrine by throwing it into a rigid scripture. He did not wish to arouse the superstitious veneration of his disciples by following the methods of the Brahmans. And there were other reasons. The old Brahman sages who compiled the Vedas and its philosophic appendices—Vyas, Jaimini and Yagnavalkya—had done so for the exclusive use of the priests who supervised sacrifices in accordance with the prescribed ritual. They were a sealed book to the laity, who had not mastered the sacred tongue; and there was no incentive for them to study books

which gave them no mental training and which had no practical value to them.

Moreover, written books in those days must have been costly and rare, added to which was the fact that they were fragile and perishable as they were all written upon the perishable birch-bark which was susceptible to the changes of weather. In the case of Buddha his very method of teaching did not lend itself to writing. He had formulated his doctrine, not for the use of a select company of scholars but for the masses, to whom he and his disciples addressed in their own vernacular dialects. His discourses were not a set series of sermons on a given subject, but disconnected and discursive, and were intended to hit off the various points that arose or called for immediate answer. Even as regards his central doctrine, he did not trust to the written word, because it was to impart "Bodhi" or wisdom to those who were taught and who had to make it their own and impart its knowledge to others in their own way and their own language.⁽¹⁾ At any rate, whatever might have been the reason, the fact remains that the teachings of Buddha were never committed to writing during his lifetime. The Master was available for ready reference. But as soon as he died, the disciples lost no time in taking steps to glean his scattered thoughts. And as writing was not then the only means of perpetuating a record, means were adopted to bring together all those who had memorized his sayings.

His words still lingered in the memories of the faithful. It was necessary to reduce them to a common factor. It called for the necessity of collective consultation. Accordingly, immediately after his death, 500 of his elder disciples—called *Mahasthavirs*, met in a vast cave called Sattapanni near Rajgrah under the *ægis* of King Ajatshatru to chant and gather together all his sayings. This was the first council.

It collected and classified all that the Master had taught and said, into three great divisions—the rules of discipline (*Vinay*);

(1) This language, so far as Magadhi is concerned, is *Pali*, 'Magadhi' as it was

called in Magadhi. Childers' *Pali Dictionary*: Preface XI, f.n. (3)

the words of the Master to his disciples—(*Suttas*) and his system of doctrine (*Abhidharm*), all the three being collectively called the *Pitaks* (or Baskets or collections) afterwards called the five *Nikayas*. From the fact that the first council chanted together all his sayings, the Council became known as *Sangit*, and in *Pali* *Sangiti*.

At this council, Kashyap—⁽¹⁾ the learned and distinguished Brahman whom Buddha had converted and who was one of his eighty great disciples whom he left surviving him, was elected as their leader to chant the *Sthavir* or “words of the elders” or precepts of the Master preserved in the memory of older men; he also communicated the Master’s philosophical doctrines—then undeveloped; the rules of discipline (*Vinay*) were recited by Upali, the family-barber of the Shakyas, who had risen to rank as one of his “chief” disciples; the ethical precepts (*Suttas*) were recounted by Anand. This was the first attempt at a classification of his teachings. But the classification was rough and far from logical or methodical, since the matter thrown into the *Suttas* was equally to be found in his precepts. However, it was the commencement of an idea and served its purpose in clarifying the line along which his disciples were to act. The rules of discipline had, however, become more clearly settled in the Master’s lifetime; and these were formally adopted as laws of the Order. They were ten in number and included prohibitions to receive money-gifts, the partaking of a second meal in the afternoon, drinking stimulating beverages, even if appearing pure as water; rules for the admission to the Order, confession in private houses, the use of comfortable seats, relaxation of monastic rules in remote country-places, atonement for breach of rules, drinking whey, storage of salt for future use, power of citing the example of others as a valid excuse for relaxing discipline.

Strict conformity to these rules was insisted on; but the fraternity soon found strict compliance with them irksome; and in course of time, it became difficult to resist the temptation

(1) Then given the honorific designation of *Maha Kashyap* (or the great Kashyap.)

of accepting money-gifts. This last became a serious bone of contention between the fraternity who became sharply divided into the strict and the lax Sangha. A hundred years had since elapsed and in or about 443 B.C., according to the orthodox date, ⁽¹⁾ a second council was convened for the settlement of outstanding disputes, which unfortunately it failed to do.

The second Council met at Vaishali (Vesali now Besarh) twenty-seven miles North of Patna, and was attended by seven hundred monks to discuss the ten prohibitions. The discussion was protracted for eight months, but in the end the previous decision was re-affirmed and a system of "Indulgences", which had since grown up, condemned.

That decision widened the schism, which had already been gaining momentum during the preceding hundred years, and the upholders of "Indulgences" formally seceded from the older party and formed themselves into a new sect. The ensuing hostility between the two sects led to their further disruption which gave birth to no less than eighteen sects which became subdivided into thirty-two sects, and in the fourth century A.D. the Chinese traveller Fa-hien refers to as many as ninety-six. But it did not retard the progress of Buddhism which continued to spread right up to the frontiers of the Punjab.

Within three hundred years of the death of the founder, his religion became sub-divided into numerous sects, of which eighteen are spoken of as the principal ones. The Chinese and Tibetan books give detailed information on the tenets held by the separatists. According to Vasumitra, who lived about 42 B.C., and whose treatise on the eighteen principal schools of Buddhism, has been translated into Chinese, the founder of Buddhism is alleged to have prophesied the disruption of his religion into the eighteen schools, into which his Dharma became disrupted. The Blessed One said: "There will be twelve schools amongst my followers hereafter, in which (the separate interpretation of) my law will be preserved in the world. These schools will be the repositories of the diversified fruits of my

(1) According to Oldenberg, 380 B.C.

Scriptures (*Pitaks*) without priority or inferiority—just as the taste of the sea-water is everywhere the same—or as the twelve sons of one man, all honest and true, so will be the expositions of my doctrines, advocated by these schools”. That the Blessed One could never have looked upon with complacency the coming into being of the eighteen antagonistic schools to wrangle over his teachings need scarcely be mentioned. The fact is that the apostles of heresy invented a prophecy so as to give their tenets an added sanctity.

The first two schools were those founded by Mahasamghikas⁽¹⁾ and Pili⁽²⁾, of which the former is said to have come into existence within a hundred years of the Founder's Nirvan. It was founded by the Ekvavhariks. A century later, another school called Kukkulikas came into existence. At similar intervals, other schools such as Bahushrutyas made their appearance. Three of them were named from the locality in which the founders lived. Such was the school of Bahushrutyas, called To-man in Tibet from the place where its founder lived, the Chattiyavadas with their Tibetan analogue—Chet-tai-ho, and Purvasailas or those of the ‘Eastern Mountain’,—another called themselves Uttarshailas, because they belonged to the ‘Northern Mountain’. But all these were off-shoots of the Mahasamghikas. Other schools followed in quick succession.

The leading feature of the various schools was that they radically differed upon almost every principle of the doctrine or of its rituals. For example, the following four schools—Mahasamghikas, Ekvavharikas, Lokottaras, Kukkulikas, maintain that the tradition respecting the Buddhs having been born into the world (as men) is incorrect, or that there was only one Tathagat in the world. They hold that Tathagat is infinitely extended, immeasurably glorious, eternal in duration, that to his power of recollection, his power of faith, his experience of joy, and his life, there is no end; he sleeps not; he speaks, asks, reflects not; and that his existence

(1) The great congregation, composed of young and old alike.

(2) The congregation ■ old men only.

They recognized only the authority ■ the original—*Vinay*.

is ever one and uniform, that all things⁽¹⁾ born may obtain deliverance by having his instruction, that in his essential existence, the Tathagat comprehends all subjects in a moment by his own wisdom. They all say that the "Turning Wheel of the Law" ■ at an end. They hold that "things exist", "relationships exist", "Truth exists". Other sects controvert those views, while a third sect of dissenters accept modifications of one or the other of the above dogmas, or enunciate those of their own. Buddhism has thus become cyclopædic of human thought, and there is no line of speculation or a dogma which does not find its supporters in one or other of the recognized schools of Buddhism. The same may equally be asserted of the Brahmanical thought.

But the political events, to which we must now advert, have a close bearing upon the history of the period that intervened between the second and the third council, which was convened by Ashoke—in or about 244 B.C.

From time immemorial and down to the fourth century B.C., the ruling kings of India had invariably been Kshatriyas to whom Brahmans became attached as priests. But the popular awakening, due to the spread of Buddhism, soon changed the political history of dynasties. The Shudras or the submerged classes had already begun to raise themselves in the social scale. Buddhism had already broken down the barrier between caste and caste. It had shattered the Brahmans' claim to supremacy. It had proclaimed the equality of man and universal brotherhood. It had received within its inner fold Shudras and Chandals. It had successfully attacked privilege, and taught man the value of freedom and self-help.

That teaching had a natural re-percussion in the political history of India. The Kshatriya rule and the Brahman supremacy had both been attacked and successfully stormed by the growing strength of the proletariat. It resulted in the dethronement of the Kshatriyas and the installation of Shudra Kings. Of these, those known as the "Nine Nandas" ruled

(1) *Eighteen schools of Buddhism* (Tr. *Antiquary*, 299-302.
by Rev. S. Beal.) (1880) *The Indian*

over India for a period of nearly 91 years, dating from about 413 B.C. ⁽¹⁾. The rule of the Nandas was brought to a close by Chandragupta, another Shudra of the Mayur ⁽²⁾ (Maurya) clan with the aid of his Brahman minister by name—Kautilya or Vishnugupta. He ascended the throne of Magadh in 322 or 325 B.C.—some 4 or 5 years after Alexander's invasion of India in 326 B.C. At that time, the Punjab was split up into many independent states. Megasthenes writing twenty years later, mentions the existence of one hundred and eighteen distinct nations or tribes in the whole of India with distinct governments of their own. According to tradition, Chandragupta was himself the son of the last Nand King by a low-born woman, said to have been the daughter of the keeper of king's peacocks, (*Mayur-poshak*) from which fact he is said to have acquired the surname of Mayur. ⁽³⁾ He had met Alexander when he came to India; and on his death, he successfully attacked and destroyed his garrison.

About the same time (321 B.C.), he effected a revolution in Pataliputra (Patna), the capital of Magadh, exterminated the Nand family and proclaimed himself as its King. He ruled for twenty-four years an empire which extended from the end of Bengal to the Hindu Kush Mountains. Afghanistan was under his sway and so was country stretching from the Himalayas to at least the Nerbada, if not to Mysore. He is said to have become a Jain and hostile to Buddhists, whom as heretics, he consigned to live with the Chandals beyond the burial grounds. ⁽⁴⁾. In 298 B.C. he abdicated the throne, became an ascetic and after twelve years starved himself to death. He was succeeded by his son, King Bindeshwar, who ruled till 273 B.C., when he was succeeded by one of his sons *Ashokevardhan* ⁽⁵⁾, commonly called Ashoke, whom his father had selected to succeed him in supersession to his elder brother—Sushim. He ascended the throne of Magadh

⁽¹⁾ V. Smith—*History of India*,—57, 58.

⁽²⁾ Sk. *Mayur*—a peacock, an epithet of Kartikaya.

⁽³⁾ Barodia (U. D.) '*History and Literature of Jainism*'—14; Mr. Vincent Smith derives '*Mayur*' from his mother's name '*Mura*,' which seems improbable.

⁽⁴⁾ Havell (H. B.) *The History of Aryan Rule in India*, 77.

⁽⁵⁾ Sk. *Ashoke*—A—negative, *Shoke*—sorrow, *Vardhan*—increasing, growth—A bestower of prosperity. *Lit.* "one who bestows happiness and prosperity".

in 265 B.C. and commemorated that event by murdering his 99 half-brothers ⁽¹⁾. In 261 B.C. he attacked and annexed the kingdom of Kalinga. But the slaughter and misery of his campaign, caused to the people of Kalinga, drove him to remorse, and he promptly embraced Buddhism and the striking change produced in his mentality is vividly portrayed by himself in his longest rock-edict No. 13, in which he ascribes his conversion to the cruelty and slaughter of his attack on Kalinga and the remorse it caused to him. He then resolves to propagate his new faith to all and sundry including the jungle-folk. True conquest, he adds, consists in the conquest of men's hearts by the law of duty or piety,—a conquest which endures beyond the grave, a conquest which he exhorts his sons and grand sons to pursue; "and, if perchance, they should become involved in a conquest by force of arms, to take their pleasure in patience and gentleness, so that they may by effort attain that joy of spirit which is available for both this world and the next."

He then adopts the language of Buddha and affirms "all men are my children" and exhorts his officers that they must beware of yielding to the vices of "envy, lack of perseverance, harshness, laziness and indolence," threatening them with his displeasure, if they should fail in their duty. Ashoke did for Buddhism what Constantine afterwards effected for Christianity; he organized it on the basis of a state-religion. This he accomplished by five means—by a council to settle the faith, by edicts promulgating its principles, by a state-department to watch over its purity, by missionaries to spread its doctrines, and by an authoritative revision of canon of the Buddhist scriptures.

In 244 B.C. he convened at Patna the third Buddhist council of one thousand elders, and the most important; for it decided to propagate the faith by missions; and Ashoke deputed his own son—Mahendra, as its first missionary to Ceylon. He is stated to have despatched altogether nine missions to distant parts of India and Burmah and to the Greek kingdoms in Asia and Africa. Of these missions, the one to Ceylon was a striking success. It appears to have gone

(1) Buddhghoah :—*Sutta Vibhag*, I—Kern :—*Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 299; *Vinay Pitak*, III—IV : 114.

there on the invitation of King Tissa who ruled for forty years. He welcomed the mission, became a convert to the new faith and expended the same energy in measures for the propagation of Buddhism in Ceylon as his friend Ashoke did in India. Mahendra⁽¹⁾ settled down in Ceylon where he died in 204 B.C. He was aided by his sister Sanghamitra, ⁽²⁾ who ably assisted him and whose name is still remembered in that island. King Tissa was not only the most earnest propagator of the faith, but he was its most magnanimous supporter.

He and all his successors built the great sacred city of Ameradhpur in which vast hill-like *dagobas*, higher than St. Paul's Cathedral, and covering many acres of ground, rear their mighty domes above the trees of a royal park, and royal baths and palaces given to the Sangh. The 7,774 Bhikkhus, who to-day keep alive the religion, are thus descendants in an unbroken succession of the great Mahendra himself, and in Ceylon monasticism has had a unique chance of proving its worth.⁽³⁾ "Rome to-day is a mean thing, the Forum, a mean jostle of littleness, compared with the sacred city—vast, resigned, silent, leisurely, with full consciousness of an eternity of desolation to face."⁽⁴⁾

Ashoke's enthusiasm for Buddhism was incessant and unbounded, and at one time he himself assumed the garb of a monk. He had his edicts engraved upon rocks and stone-pillars and had them installed all over the country, not excluding the most distant and inaccessible regions of his Empire. These are stated to have numbered as many as 84,000 and it is not surprising, seeing that, in spite of the despoliation by time and the hand of conquerors, no less than thirty monolith columns or pillars have been traced and many more are likely to be yet discovered. They were well distributed all over his empire which then included as already observed, Afghanistan, Baluchistan, the Swat valley with the adjoining tribal territory Kashmir, Nepal and the whole of India, with the exception of Assam, and as far South as the northern districts of Mysore.

(1) V. Smith describes him as Ashoke's *Mitra*—friend—Friend of the Sangha. brother. *History of India*, 99.

(2) K. J. Sanders—*The story of Buddhism*, 76-79.

(3) Sk. Sangh—congregation—name assigned to Buddhist congregations :

(4) Farrer—*In old Ceylon*, 346.

They were not only the Moral Code, but became the Penal Code, enforced by censors appointed for the purpose. They dealt with the following points:—

- (1) Prohibition of the slaughter of animals for food or sacrifice.
- (2) Provision of a system of medical aid for men and animals, and of plantations and wells on the road-side.
- (3) Order for a quinquennial humiliation and re-publication of the great moral precepts of the Buddhist faith.
- (4) Comparison of the former state of things, and the happy existing state under the King.
- (5) Appointment of missionaries to go into various countries, which are enumerated, to convert the people and foreigners.
- (6) Appointment of informers (or inspectors) and guardians of morality.
- (7) Expression of a desire that there may be uniformity of religion and equality of rank.
- (8) Contrast of the carnal pleasures of previous rulers with the pious enjoyments of the present King.
- (9) Inculcation of the true happiness to be found in virtue, through which alone the blessing of Heaven can be propitiated.
- (10) Contrast of the vain and transitory glory of this world with the reward for which the King strives and looks beyond.
- (11) Inculcation of the doctrine that the imparting of Dharm or teaching of virtue to others is the greatest of charitable gifts.
- (12) Address to all unbelievers.
- (13) (Imperfect; the meaning conjectural.)
- (14) Summary of the whole.⁽¹⁾

(1) Ouel's Summary, *Hunter's Indian Empire*—191, 192.

The edicts were not uniform. He enjoined obedience to parents, truth-speaking, compassion to all, kind treatment of hired servants and slaves, charity and toleration of other religions. He carried out his own precepts—built rest-houses, dug wells, and planted trees on the road-side for the comfort of travellers, opened free hospitals for man and beast, not only in his own empire, but also in the territories of friendly and independent States. In some of his edicts, he enjoined "intense self-examination, intense obedience, intense dread, intense effort" ⁽¹⁾ And he inculcated other virtues taken from the "*Buddhist Dharm.*" In his old age, Ashoke suffered from mental weakness which led to his indulging in extravagances which necessitated the intervention of his ministers; and latterly it became necessary to appoint a Prince-Regent to carry on the administration. It appears that a few years before his death, he was a witness to the current of reaction against his protection of Buddhism to the detriment of other communities, in which his own wife took part.

There are no historical data to fix the date of Ashoke's death which is said to have occurred at Taxila in 232, 226 ⁽²⁾ or 223 B.C. Of his consorts Karuvaki and Asadhi-Mitra, the latter—who appears to have been his favourite wife for many years—died, leaving a son Kunal, whereupon Ashoke married a young ill-natured woman named Tishyarakshit whom he raised to the dignity of Queen ⁽³⁾ but who became hostile to Buddhism and unsuccessfully tried to destroy its chief emblem—the Bodhi tree at Gaya by means of incantations. ⁽⁴⁾ She fell in love with her own step-son Kunal, whose beautiful eyes aroused in her a violent passion for him, which, however, he a devout Buddhist, indignantly repulsed. It sufficed to turn her love to hate and she conspired with the King's courtiers to take his life. Kunal escaped death but only after his eyes had been put out. He wandered about, and when the King learnt the truth he was so enraged that he had her burnt

(1) *Pillar Edicts*—I.

(2) Havell (E. B.) "*The History of Aryan Rule in India* 102.

(3) *Mahavans*, (Colombo Ed. 1889) 134;

Ashoke married her three or four years after the death of his favourite wife Asandhimitta.

(4) *Divyavadan* (Camb. 1886) 397.

alive and all her co-conspirators similarly punished. In 225 B.C. Ashoke became an ascetic, issued the Rupnath and Sasseram edicts, and two years later died.⁽¹⁾ He was succeeded by his sons, one of whom, Jalauk, who appears to have ruled from Kashmere, reversed his father's policy and, being an ardent Shivite, expelled the Buddhists from the valley. The varying fortunes of Buddhism were once more brought to a head in the reign of the Shakya King—Kanishk, whose rule extended over Northern India and the adjoining countries. His authority appears also to have had its nucleus in Kashmir, but it extended to both sides of the Himalayas from Yarkand and Khokand to Agra and Sind. The seat of his Central Government was Purushpur (now Peshawar), where he erected imposing buildings, though he became known as the King of Gandhar.

He convened the fourth and last of the Buddhist Councils in 40 A.D. to once more settle the disputed questions of Buddhist faith and practice. The decrees of the Council took the form of authorised commentaries on the canon, which were engraved on copper-plates, enclosed in a stone-coffer and deposited for safety in a stup, erected for the purpose at the capital of Kashmir where the Council met. Only delegates from the Northern church—the Mahayan, the greater vehicle, were admitted to this Council, being the cult that had gained ascendancy in his time; the Hinayan or the lesser vehicle which represented the orthodox church was wholly ignored.

This Council was held under Parsva and Vasumitra. It was attended by five hundred monks who composed three Sanskrit works of the nature of commentaries ⁽²⁾ on the three Pali *Pitaks*. These were the earliest books of the Mahayan or Great vehicle of the Northern School which developed its doctrine on the Indus; while the Pali canon of the South represented the older doctrine formulated on the Ganges. Kashmir had always been noted for its Sanskrit learning and Kanishk, its patron, lent

(1) Cunningham...*Corpus Inscriptionem Indicarum* (1877) p. vii: Ashoke remarried 228, she attempts to destroy the Bodhi tree—Ashoke becomes an ascetic 225, issues Rupnath and Sasseram edicts; and dies 223 B.C. succeeded by Dasarath;

hi cave inscription 215.

(2) V. Smith in his *History of India*, 134, states the facts exactly in the reverse order. He says the Council was composed solely of the Hinayan.

his weight to the Northern school, as Ashoke had lent it to the Southern school. Hence in process of time, scriptures of the Northern school began to be composed in Sanskrit, with an inter-mixture of Gathas or Stanzas in an irregular dialect—half Sanskrit, half Prakrit : of these, the nine Nepalese canonical scriptures dealt with the following subjects :⁽¹⁾

- (1) *Prajna Paramita*—(Transcendental knowledge, or an abstract of metaphysical and mystic philosophy).
- (2) *Gand Vyntha*.
- (3) *Das Bhumeswar*—(Describes the ten stages leading to Buddhhood).
- (4) *Samadhi Raja*—(Meditation).
- (5) *Lankavatar*.
- (6) *Saddharm pundrika* (Lotus of the true law).
- (7) *Tantra gata guhyak* (the secret Tantric doctrine).
- (8) *Lalit Vistar*.—"Life Beautiful " giving a legendary life of Buddh).
- (9) *Suvarna Prabhas*.

The widening gulf between the two schools, which had been growing ever since the assemblage of the first Council, had by now become too wide to permit of a reapproachment. And the exclusion of the one sect in the fourth Council made all hopes of reconciliation impossible. In fact, there was no attempt in that direction since Kanishk took note of the fact as he found it ; and with his sympathies on the side of his own school, inspite of his position as King of Gandhar, he was not the person best fitted to act as a mediator. Moreover, the schism that had grown between the Northern and the Southern school, though it had originated in a difference of practice, had by now widened into a difference of tenets.

Within twenty seven years of the meeting of the fourth Council, another school sprang out of the Northern school—the Buddhist Canon of China (67-1285 A.D.) which followed an

(1) *Upadesh*—Exhortations ;
Vinay Bibhasha—explanation of the

Vinay or doctrine ; and *Abhidharm Vibhasha*—
Commentary on *Abhidharm*.

independent line of its own and re-settled the tenets in its own way; and thus out of the Orthodox Church there sprung up three independent schools, each differing from the other upon matters of doctrine and practice. That these divergences became inevitable and were to some extent forced upon them by causes not only explains their history but also the tenets to which they stood committed and which must first be set out. Buddha had taught his disciples to practise virtue, the merit of which lay in Nirvan. He had pledged them to live the life of abject penury. His disciples had accepted his creed without question. His sublime doctrine of selflessness was illustrated by the example of his own life. But as soon as he died, the touch of his magnetism was removed; his disciples were unable to resist the allurements of wealth. They also felt the growing pressure of other religions, the hostility of which towards the new faith had only been suspended, but was not vanquished.

In his enthusiasm for the new creed, Ashoke had given the new religion a stimulus—the effect of which transcended the confines of his own Empire. He had despatched missions in all directions, and the advent of Alexander with his philosophic Court had carried the elements of his doctrine to the distant academies of Alexandria and Palestine⁽¹⁾. These missionaries had learnt as much as they had taught. They were everywhere met with queries about the eternal questions of God and the future life. They were told of the existence of Elysium fields, to which the souls of holy men returned to enjoy eternal life. They had been told that the incentive held out by Buddhism was inadequate to the sacrifice required. Nearer home, the revival of Hinduism was disconcerting the peoples' minds. It only needed a leader, and one was soon found in the person of Purushmitra.

It appears that the great Empire which Ashoke had built up and which he left as a heritage to Buddhism was soon dismembered by internal commotion and external aggression. Only forty or fifty years after Ashoke's death, the Punjab

(1) Hunter's *Indian Empire*, 195.

was brought under the foreign rule of the Bactrian King Demetrius, who styled himself as "King of the Indians." His invasion flung open the frontiers of India to other invaders, of whom two Greeks, Pantaleon and Agathokles, have left a record in their coins, struck to mark their rule over the land of the five rivers. A still more intrepid race attempted to seize the kingdom of India. In about 175 B.C. Menander advanced with a strong force and, after annexing the Kingdoms of Kabul and the Punjab, was about to penetrate the interior of India when his victorious march was arrested by Purushmitra, the commander-in-chief of Brihadrath, the last of the Mayur (Maurya) Kings to rule over the kingdom of Magadh. He gave the Greek adventurer battle, defeated him and himself usurped the country, of which he proclaimed himself the King. He extended his victorious march right down to the Indus delta of Saurashtra (Kathiawar), penetrated into the holy city of Mathura on the Jamna, besieged Madhgamika (now Nagari, near Chitor in Rajputana), invested Saketa in southern Oudh and threatened, if he did not actually take, Pataliputra (Patna)—the capital of old-time Magadh. Purushmitra belonged to the Sunga clan and thus became the founder of the Sunga dynasty which is said to have lasted for 112 years until 73 B.C.

In Purushmitra the idol worshippers found a powerful leader. He gave to Hinduism the same impetus which Ashoke had given to Buddhism. Purushmitra attacked Buddhism with unscrupulous virulence and it is said, he made it his business to burn down a multitude of monasteries, carrying his ravages as far north as Jalandhar. Purushmitra may have been an Iranian fire-worshipper, but he was reckoned a Hindu and on behalf of Hinduism he carried on a relentless crusade against Buddhism, and to celebrate his triumph, he performed the Vedic horse-sacrifice (*Ashwamedh*)⁽¹⁾ to mark his success as an all-conquering King of Kings.

Alongside of the revival of this orthodoxy, India was being transformed by the influence of the Greek invader.

(1) See Glossary.

The coins of Kanishk were engraved in a form of Greek characters and they bore upon them the impress of the strange admixture of Greek and Indian gods, and they mark the Hellenic influence which had blended with and transformed the beliefs of the Buddhist Kings. Moreover, for at least a hundred years ⁽¹⁾, if not more, the Greek Kings were rulers and, though they became Hinduised more than the Hindu princes became Hellenized, there can be scarcely any doubt that—while the older religions stood aloof, the religion of Buddha was faced with problems, the solution of which was found by Kanishk ⁽²⁾ and his successors in the concessions, which brought the two faiths to a closer point of contact. But it must be remembered that at this time the Greek thought was in its decline; and consequently the Hellenic influence upon Indian speculation was not sufficient to destroy its individuality. But its influence was nevertheless there; and can be read not only in the coins but in the drama ⁽³⁾ and the fine Arts,—as witness the remarkable local school of Græco-Buddhist sculpture in the Gandhar frontier province, where it is reflected in the interior, and which even determined the type of Chinese and Japanese Buddhist images. This influence was never on the wane, and though the Greeks became completely Hinduised and became merged in the rest of the population, their influence became even more marked during the ascendancy of the Guptas (320-480 A.D.)—to which the coins of their reign, still extant, vividly testify.

Nor was this all. The Empire of Buddhism was in the reign of Ashoke the extent of his own Empire. But while the latter shrank with his death, the former had already transcended its geographical limits. It had converted Ceylon; and its sphere of influence had been extended to the kingdoms on the shores of the Mediterranean and Caspian seas ⁽⁴⁾ and to the whole of Asia Minor where, it is said to have created a religious ferment; and which had probably extended


(1) From 208 B.C. to ■ B.C. See V. Smith—*History of India* 145, 146.

(2) Who in the Ara In-cription described himself as Caesar.

(3) Windisch points out the main

striking resemblances in form between the classical Indian dramas and the plays of the school of Menander.

(4) Kirghiz carried it there—Hunter's *Indian Empire* 194, 195.



(12) Kanishka Casket Crystal reliquary with Buddha's relics, etc.

even up to the banks of the Tiber and to the very heart of the celestial Empire. Three missions were certainly sent to the Roman emperors in A.D. 336, 361 and 530, while long before then (200 B.C.) the gospel of Peace had become established in Central Asia and China, which sent pilgrims like Fa-Hian (399 A.D.) and Hiuen Tsiang (629 A.D.) to collect the canon and pay their reverence to the hallowed ground in which Buddha had preached his doctrine. At this distance of time, it is difficult to say what was the degree of these extraneous influences; though judging from the coinage, it may be safely presumed that when the coin "Dinar" becomes "Denarius" to denote a gold coin, the relation between the two countries must have been more intimate than can be asserted as a historical fact.

The combined impact of these ideas gave the Northern school its individuality which became hardened with the efflux of time. According to the tenets of the Southern School, Buddha was no more than a man; and when he died, he only survived, as he had himself said it, in the Law. His whole teaching excluded the necessity of a vain search for God or of the possibility of securing salvation through the favour of a mediator. And as regards monks, they understood the Master to have allowed them no room for repentance and return to their former status, after they had been once expelled from the Sangh for any transgression. On all these points the Northern school joined issue. They denied that the dead Teacher did not continue to be a living Saviour, to whom prayers might be offered and whose worship was enjoined and whose intervention sought, through the medium of Bodhisatvas and other beings, acting as mediators between him and the sinful men. The apotheosis of Buddha led to the overthrow of the old doctrine of Nirvan, and the place which it had hitherto occupied in the Buddhistic cosmogony. In the matter of ritual they favoured indulgences for out-casted monks.

Other developments followed. The older school, whose doctrines are expressed in the engravings at Sanchi and

Bharhut, dared not depict the image of Buddha, lest it should savour of idolatry. When the scene depicted required his presence, they merely indicated it by a symbol, an empty seat, or pair of foot-prints. But with the revolt of the Northerners, these puritan ideas led to the swing of the pendulum, and the revolt and the reform in sculptural designs, due to Hellenic influences, led to the wildest imagery—in which every incident in Gautam's life as Bodhisatv in in heaven and here, was depicted; and his image in endless forms and replicas became the principal element in Buddhist sculpture.

This vivid portraiture was intended to popularize the creed with the rustic and the dull-witted mountaineer, while its ethical transformation was probably influenced at one time by the combined pressure of the Brahman and the Hellenic paganism, while at a later period nascent Christianity met full-grown Buddhism in the academies and markets of Asia and Egypt, where both religions were exposed to the influences of surrounding paganism in many forms and in the countless works of art which gave expression to the ideas of polytheism. The ancient religion of Persia contributed to the ferment of human thought, excited by improved facilities for international communication and by the incessant clash of rival civilizations.

The Brahmans had always been a non-proselytizing, exclusive system, limited to those who were born and brought up therein. Those who went outside its narrow confines were free to do so; but they were then not free to return. Brahmanism, consequently, never expanded beyond the believers which it had counted as falling within the pale of its caste. Buddhism, on the other hand, had burst the bonds of its limited frontiers almost within a few years of its birth. And in only two or three centuries, it had forced its way along the busy caravan tracks through Persia or Afghanistan or by the sea-route along the Persian Gulf; while the philosophers and scientists, who accompanied Alexander, had returned taking with them all that was to be known about the religions and philosophy of India. It thus furnished to the West, equally

with its religion, its ideal of the holy life,—with its monks, nuns, relic-worship, bells and rosaries, confessions and indulgences and all the detailed liturgy and ritual which is now the accepted canon of Christianity.

But while Buddhism was thus extending its conquest both in the East and the West, a reaction seems to have set in against its further growth in the land of its birth. It appears to have attained its zenith of power during the reign of Ashoke. Thereafter, it suffered recurring vicissitudes, varying with the fortunes of its political patrons; and we have the testimony of the historians who chronicled Alexander's exploits and of the Greek ambassador, Megasthenes, who succeeded them (300 B.C.) in their literary labours,—that Brahmanism was then the predominant religion; and for the intervals when it was eclipsed by Buddhism, Brahmanism continued to maintain its influence generally, though in the process of time it was greatly leavened by Buddhism which it finally absorbed in the seventh century. But in the meantime it had expanded to, and consolidated its position in the rest of inhabited Asia. It has already been stated that it had penetrated China as early as 200 B.C., Korea (372 A.D.), Java (400 A.D.), Japan (532 A.D.) and Siam (638 A.D.), while it took Tibet and Central Asia, as they lay along its regular route to China; and a few centuries later Buddh was recognized as a Christian martyr and his name inscribed in the Christian martyrology and the 27th day of November was held sacred to him. St. John of Damascus wrote an account of his martyrdom in Greek in the eighth century, an Arabic translation of whose work, dated the eleventh century, still survives. By the twelfth century the life of "Barlaam and Josaphat had already reached western Europe in a Latin form."

During the first half of the thirteenth century, Vincent de Beauvais inserted it in his *Speculum Historiale*; and a few years later, it found a place in the Golden Legend of Jacques de Voragine. Meanwhile, it had also been popularized by the Troubadour-Guy de Cambrai. From this double source,—the Golden Legend of the Church, and the French poem of the people,

the story of Barlaam and Josaphat spread throughout Europe, —German, Provencal, Italian, Spanish, English and Norse versions carrying it from the Southern extremity of the continent to Sweden and Iceland. In 1583, at the end of the saints for the 27th November, the Roman Martyrology contained the following note in Latin: "Among the Indians who border on Persia, Saints Barlaam and Josaphat, (are to be commemorated) whose wonderful works have been written by St. John of Damascus⁽¹⁾."

Such was then the advance of Buddhism in the two continents. But in India—the land of its birth, Buddhism appears to have maintained a steady struggle for supremacy, of which a vivid account is given by the two Chinese pilgrims ⁽²⁾ who visited India in the fifth and seventh centuries. The earlier of the two, Fa-Hian (399-413 A.D.), entered India through Afghanistan and journeyed down the whole Gangetic valley to the Bay of Bengal. Of them it is written: "Never did more devoted pilgrims leave their native country to encounter the perils of travel in foreign and distant lands; never did disciples more ardently desire to gaze on the sacred vestiges of their religion; never did men endure greater than those simple-minded earnest Buddhist priests." Hiuen Tsiang (629-645 A.D.), —a still greater pilgrim, also entered India by the Central Asian route and has left a fuller record of the state of the two religions as he found them in his wanderings throughout India, describing the two religions as eagerly competing for the suffrages of the people. At this time Brahmanism was, indeed, striving to rear its head at the expense of Buddhism, which, however, was still firmly established from the Himalyas to the Narbada, and from the Punjab to the North-eastern Bengal. Here he found one hundred Buddhist convents and ten thousand monks. While the whole country was ruled by Shiladitya, the powerful Buddhist King, who was equally tolerant of Hinduism and protected their two hundred temples.

Shiladitya emulated the example of Ashoke and following his example he convened a general Council in 634 A.D.; but

(1) Hunter's *Indian Empire*—196, 197.

(2) A third—Sang Yun, started about

518 A.D., but appears to have returned from Peshawar.

unlike the previous Councils, the object of this Council was neither to concert plans for the consolidation of Buddhism, nor to settle its disputed points—of tenets or practice. It was a general Council and not a Buddhist council, to which Brahmans and Buddhists had been equally invited, as were his twenty-seven tributary princes who were present. At this Council Shiladitya held a general debate between Brahmans on the one hand, and Buddhists of the two Orders on the other, and to mark his impartiality, he installed a statue of Buddha on the first day, and on the second, an image of the Sun-god, Mitra, and on the third day, an idol of Shiv. The work of the Council was more spectacular than real; and at its conclusion, Shiladitya held a great sacrificial feast (*Yajna*) at the confluence of the Ganges and the Jamna at Allahabad, where he distributed his royal treasures, as was his wont every five years, and made the Brahmans and Buddhists and even the heretics equal participants of his bounty. At the end of the festival which lasted seventy-five days, he stripped off his jewels and royal raiment, handed them to the by-standers, and like Buddha of old, put on the rags of a beggar. By this ceremony he commemorated the Great Renunciation of the founder of Buddhism. At the same time he discharged the highest duty, inculcated alike by the Buddhist and Brahmanical religions, *vice versa* namely alms-giving.

The last notable patron of Buddhism was the famous King Harsh (588-647 A.D.), who ruled for nearly forty-one years till his death (606-647 A.D.) and had once more brought the whole of India from Delhi to the Bay of Bengal under one Empire. He emulated the example of Ashoke, forbade the slaughter of animals for food, planted trees, patronized the great monasteries of Naland, and judging from the account of the Chinese pilgrim, Hiuen Tsiang, he ruled over his kingdom justly. In 643 A.D. he convened a council as Shiladitya had done seven years before, and inaugurated it, as Shiladitya had done, by unveiling the image of Buddha with the highest honours, after which the effigies of the Sun-god (Mitra) and Shiv were worshipped with reduced ceremonials. He distributed all his treasures and died in 646 or 647, leaving his kingdom in a state

of utter disorder ; his kingdom fell an easy prey to the machinations of his minister, resulting in its disruption into smaller kingdoms, most of which were short-lived, till the country once more assumed the semblance of temporary unity under the rule of another famous king Bhoj (840-890 A.D.), a Parihar Rajput of Kanauj. He was, however, a devoted worshipper of Vishnu and does not appear to have molested or assisted the Buddhists.

A zealous parton of Buddhism was, however, found a century later in Dharmpal, the virtual founder of the Pal dynasty who assumed the kingship of Bengal ; who ruled it for a period of twenty years (875-895 A.D.) and founded the Vikramshila at Patharghata in the Bhagalpur district ; but his Buddhism was only a corrupt form of the Mahayan doctrine and scarcely distinguishable from Hinduism.

Huen Tsiang travelled all over India from the Punjab to the mouth of the Ganges and down South to Madras. He found everywhere the two religions mingled, except in southern India where the newer faith still held its ascendancy. But the two religions, though seemingly commingled, were in reality in the death-grip of each other. Buddhism had already lost much of its vitality by its disruption into rival sects and warring Orders. Its transformation in the north had considerably weakened its individuality. Its stern unbending rationalism, however attractive to the mind, was cold and frigid when the mind was warmed by emotion. Its boundless altruism, however pleasing to the moralist, could not easily subdue the fundamental instinct of mankind. Its obscure monotheism, undefined or undefinable, stood pale and dumb before the dazzling impersonations of the Brahm of an older and more venerable faith.

Its conception of Nirvan, as its concept of God, was little distinguishable from annihilation and atheism to the popular mind. The fact is that a strictly logical system can never take the place of a popular religion. And when the fire that was kindled by the founder, had produced the white heat of enthusiasm in his devotees and become wide-spread, it lost its pristine glow, while the corruption that had set in, weakened

its defensive forces against a faith, the bold outline of which impressed alike the credulity and the superstitious instincts of the simple people. And other causes intervened.

About 750 A.D. there arose a Brahman preacher in Bengal, Kumaril Bhatt by name, who once more fired the imagination of the people by calling upon them to return to their ancestral faith. He held before them the picture of a personal God—the God of their fathers, which touched their conservative instincts. The preacher's return was opportune to the cause of Hinduism. A wave of reaction had already set in; and it was fanned by the unscrupulous brutality of the ruling potentates. It is said that edged on by the religious preacher Sudhanwan, a prince in southern India "commanded the slaughter of all old men and children of the Buddhists from the Bridge of Ram ⁽¹⁾ to the snowy mountain: let him who slays not, be slain."⁽²⁾ Sudhanwan's authority did not extend so far; but it is an exaggeration which overlay an undoubted fact.

The activities of Kumaril were supplemented by Shankaracharya, another preacher of orthodoxy. He did for the South what Kumaril Bhatt had been doing for the North, and led by their example the lesser Brahmans throughout India raised a similar cry for the suppression of Buddhism by the wholesale slaughter of its followers. They even fired the imagination of the princes by reminding them of the prophecy—that the tenth incarnation of Vishnu was to descend with flaming sword in hand to destroy the lying faith. ⁽³⁾ This challenge was taken up in grim earnest by all religious reactionaries who conspired to serve the cause of "Dharm" by helping to expel the new-fangled faith. There was a national revival of Sanatan Dharm ⁽⁴⁾ and the princes and peasants once more rallied to the cry; and in this great wave of fanatical zeal, Buddhism as such was swept out of the land. This was about 1000 A.D. But it continued to linger in the cradle of its birth down to 1199 A.D. when Bakhtiar Khilji overthrew the last of the Pal Rajas of Magadh.

(1) The ridge of reefs between India and Ceylon.

(2) Quoted by H.H. Wilson—*Two Essays*, 366. *Colebrook's Essays*—190.

(3) See *ante*. P. 183.

(4) Sk. "Sanatan"—Primeval, ancient, Dharm—religion. "The ancient faith."

It has been stated before that Hinduism drove out Buddhism from India. But the means it employed were only locally and partially forcible. In the eleventh century when Buddhism became an exile from its mother-land, India had already become politically dismembered into its several smaller states, and it is possible, Buddhism lost its hold on the people, because of the superior spectacular attractions of Hinduism with their numerous gods and goddesses and the intimate association of the Brahmans with the people. It is also clear that Hinduism absorbed some of the tenets of Buddhism, though the repulsion of the former to human equality and the removal of disabilities of women, must have appealed to the innate instincts of the people whose class and race prejudice could not be permanently overcome by the higher ethics of a great religion. Nor could their love of the past, with the easier means of securing salvation by sacrifices and penance practised without renunciation of the family, be easily abandoned in favour of a doctrine, the complexity of whose philosophy and the doubtful bliss of whose Nirvan offered no superior attraction to the mechanical performance of a worship and the acquisition of a prize—which captured their sensuous imagination. And, above all, the generality of men could not reconcile themselves to the dismal fate of living without a soul and without even a body which they could call their own, and when death came, the prospect of being born again a pig or a toad according to the grim law of Fate—did not satisfy their yearnings to meet again their beloved relations and friends, from whom they had parted and for whose company they longed as a reparation of the bereavements of the present life.

In the countries to which Buddhism had migrated and where it still flourishes, the people had really no organized religion of their own. But Buddhism made no headway in Asia Minor or further west, where other religions came into conflict with its morbid pessimism. And in India itself, the fact is that the fire which the teachings of Buddha had lighted, became dimmed by the sloth and indulgence of the monks who found the irksome monastic life levying too heavy a toll upon their faith, which became seriously shaken by the growth and development of the

Northern school. The old monasteries of the new Order became occupied by the hierophants of the older faith which, in places, tried to reconcile the old with the new, as witness, the monastery observance of no caste—is still being observed; but otherwise the place had been altered to the worship of a Hindu god. Jainism, which had run an unequal race with Buddhism, readily absorbed what remained of it after its citadel had been stormed, and its inmates capitulated to their old masters.

It is still a question in religious causerie whether Buddhism will ever regain its lost footing. The fact appears to be that with the wider study of its vast and varied literature and the compendious synthesis of its tenets, it might once more draw to its fold the literate; but the prospects of Buddhism ever becoming a national religion in India are to-day the most remote and uncertain. Buddh had himself prophesied for it a life no longer than 500 years. That it has outlived that period many times over is nevertheless a token of its innate vitality. But it is not likely to obtain another Ashoke, nor does the political history of the country point to that end. With a religious neutrality professed by its present masters and the advent and the growing competition of other and younger creeds, the happening of such a contingency is a chimera and an idle dream.

As it is, Buddhism in India (including Burma) numbers only about 5 p.c. of the Hindu population among its adherents, most of whom are resident in Burmah, besides which, a number of them are resident of the Eastern Himalayas and the Northern tracts of Kashmir bordering on Tibet, while it is still the state-religion of the small Sikkim state. Their numerical strength all told, is over 10 millions; 11,571,000 persons having returned themselves as belonging to that faith, ⁽¹⁾ while the number of Jains was about a tenth of them, being only 178,596. But at the same time a large number of other reforming sects—such as Sikhs and Brahmos have sprung up which carry on an internecine conflict with Hinduism and whose population denudes Hinduism of its numbers, as Christianity and Mahomedanism are doing from without. These two new religions are running with

(1) (1921) I Census Report (Pt. I), §. 85, P. 110.

Hinduism an unequal race ; for, while Hinduism is a non-prose-lytizing creed and can make no converts, both Mahomedanism and Christianity are missionary religions and are making serious inroads upon the venerable faith. They numbered at the last census about 67 millions and 47 millions respectively, while the Sikhs stood only second to them, being over 32 millions.

There is a growing national revival in the country, as indeed in China ; and in both countries the educated middle classes are trying to hurl back the tide of western materialism and revive the faith, the exalted ethics of which is its chief attraction.

But though Buddhism was thus sent into exile, its influence over India never ceased ; and with the noble spirit of self-sacrifice and charity, which it breathed into Hinduism, as it later did into Christianity, it bequeathed to both many of its institutions unimpaired, together with its scheme of religious life, and the material fabric of its worship.

It is curious that the Aryan mind which reached the sublime heights of human speculation should have discarded its application to religion in favour of an anthropomorphic system which readily found currency amongst its people. On the other hand, the tenets of Buddhism, discarded by the Aryan mind, have become the prized heritage of the Mongolian race. Even Ceylon which preserves the original casket of the Buddhist creed is Dravidian. It would seem as if the Aryan mind, inured to patriarchal sway, could not reconcile its predilection for patriarchal hierarchy with its philosophic doubt as to its ultimate reality. In any case, it is a singular coincidence that while the Brahmanical India and the Christian Europe have both discarded the essence of the doctrine, they have both assimilated its ritual to their divergent systems, shewing once more how much the purity of a creed is affected by the medium through which it has to filter, and that religion is in the end more a child of mass consciousness than the faithful popularization of the message of the Messiah.

So far as Hinduism itself is concerned, Buddhism did not leave it until it had impressed upon it its own imprint of indivi-

duality. The fact is that when Buddhism was banished from India, there was nothing to banish, since all its dogmas and its doctrines had already become absorbed into Hinduism; while, apart from that heritage, it had still left behind Jainism as a distinct religion, and Buddhism was to Jainism what protestant Christianity afterwards became to Roman Catholicism.

The history of Jainism will be given later. For the present it will suffice to state that out of the ashes of Buddhism in India, several cults and sects have since come into existence to reform Hinduism, while a movement is on foot to revive the glories of Buddhism by its re-introduction in the land where it held sway for no less than 1,600 years and where its beneficent influence still survives behind the tenuous veil of Hinduism.

Outside the borders of India, the two schools were formed and became the basis for its further development. The northern countries, such as Nepal, Tibet, China, Manchuria, Mongolia, Korea and Japan—follow the authority of the Mahayan school; while the southern countries, such as Ceylon, Burmah and Siam preferably follow the Hinyan school.

It will be observed that the three things which entered into the earlier conception of Buddhism were Buddha himself, his law or precepts and his Sangh or the congregation of his monks. This accidental trinity suggested to the Buddhist its connection with the Vedic triad of gods, Agni (Fire) Indra (Thunder) and Surya (the Sun) for which was substituted the later Trinity of Hindu Gods, Brahm (the Creator), Vishnu (the Preserver) and Shiv (the Destroyer). These in turn were said to possess three material counter-parts, being the *gunas*, qualities or constituents of the material universe, namely, *Sattv* ⁽¹⁾, *Rajas* ⁽²⁾ and *Tamas* ⁽³⁾; and these again ended in the triple name of Brahma-Sacchidanand ⁽⁴⁾. Following the analogy of the Hindu Trinity, the first development of Buddhist symbolism was the personification of their three kings into a personified triad which they regarded as emblems of the

(1) Sk. *Sattv*.—truth—endowed with the quality of truth.

(2) Sk. *Rajas*—the quality of passion.

(3) SS. *Tamas*—the quality of darkness.

(4) 'Sat'—Existent; 'Chit'—Conscious; 'Anand'—bliss; the Unity of Being, Consciousness and Bliss.

following—(1) the **Buddh**—that is **Gautam Buddh** typifying the present world ; (2) His **Law** or **Dharm**—that is, his doctrine personified, incarnated and manifested in a visible form after his **Parinirvan**—converting **Buddh's** figure of speech regarding himself—viz., that he will live in the Law into a visible embodiment of his idea. It must have been suggested by the Vedic theory of *Avatar* or reincarnation of the Deity. (3) His **Sangh** or Order of monks also personified or embodied in a kind of ideal personification or collective unity of his three disciples.

These three personifications were the first approach towards theistic Buddhism and were commonly known as the first **Buddhist Triad**, which became the form of invocation and the ritual for conversion ; it had to be repeated three times. They were the three in one and the one in three—"the three honoured ones" or "the three precious ones" or the "three holies".

It was represented by a rod with three prongs in imitation of the **Vishnu's Trident**. (1) It was the first stage in the introduction of idolatrous worship which was soon followed up by the supposed, real, or allegorical images of **Buddh** as the embodiment of law. They took the form of a man with four arms and hands, two of which are folded in worship, while one holds the book (or sometimes a lotus) and the other a rosary. In some, however, there is no rosary.

The **Sangh** was also depicted by the image of a man with only two hands, with one hand resting on the knee and the other holding a book : the three together constitute a **Trinity**.

Its later development was only natural. Surrounded as Buddhism was with Paganism on all sides and, finding as it did, that Paganism was the religion of the West, which the fugitive Greeks in the decadence of their race imported into India, Buddhism could not long withstand the force of this dual impact. Moreover, it soon found that the man at large always was and will ever remain pagan in his belief, and idolatrous in his worship. As in his sickness and sorrow he wants a living comforter, so in his aspirations of life and in his sickness and pain, he needs the comfort of a visible entity.

(1) *Sk. Trishula*—"Three-pronged."



(13) *Kubera and Hariti, stone—Sahri Bahkol.*

He finds no comfort in a mere abstraction. These cravings of the mind soon found outward expression in the multiplication of images, in the deification of Buddha and in the necessary and consequential powers of evil. It became the first radiating point in the Mahayan doctrine.

Thus having provided themselves with a god it next became necessary to provide themselves with a heaven and the means of getting there: in other words, a redeemer. This double object was gained by the necessary variations in the interpretation of the term "Bodhisatv"⁽¹⁾—a term which needs to be explained. According to the Buddhist religion, a person cannot become a Buddha until he first attains the rank of a Bodhisatv, who is consequently a "Buddh to be," one who has by his purity and perfection attained such high rank and privileged position that at his next birth he is destined to be born a Buddha and thereafter enjoy "Parinirvan" or cessation from further births and death, and the supreme bliss of eternal absorption in the spirit. Before his final birth, a Bodhisatv is merely a being in whom true knowledge is rather latent and undeveloped than perfected or manifest. It is the state which man attains after countless incarnations and when he has accumulated sufficient merit to enter the hierarchy of future Buddhas.

As such, Buddha had been a Bodhisatv in the Tusht heaven.⁽²⁾ And when in the fulness of time he decided to be born as Buddha, he transferred his own Bodhisatvship to "Maitreya,"⁽³⁾ the loving and compassionate one who became the Buddha-elect, dwelling and presiding as his predecessor had done in the Tusht (Tushit) heaven—the heaven of contentment, and as the Buddha to be, he is interested in the progress of his people in this world. Now in the Buddhist cosmogony there are several such Bodhisatvas who are born as Buddhas—Gautam himself was the twenty-fifth such Buddha, and the fourth one to appear in the present age following his three predecessors,

Bodhi—knowledge; *Satv*—Self, ⁽²⁾ *Mitra*—"Friend." In the *Vedas*—
 "Self enlightened knowledge." "Maitreya" is the "Sun-god" who be-
⁽³⁾ *Tusht*—"Contented," "satisfied."—fringed men by imparting to them
 A heaven of satisfied beings. own warmth.

Krakuchand, Kanak Muni and Kashyap. There was only one more Buddha to follow Gautam, and he was Maitreya.

This did not give much encouragement to the Bhikkhus and the lay brethren, who were equally anxious to be raised to the degree of Bodhisatvas and who equally aspired to come down one day as Buddhas. The narrow cosmogony of the older church gave such aspirants no encouragement. It gave the Northerners an occasion to supply this want by liberalizing their creed. They effected this by multiplying the Bodhisatvas and by creating a slightly lower rank of heavenly saints whom they called "Pratyek Buddha" and who were persons who had attained perfection for themselves and by themselves alone and not as a member of any monastic order, nor through the teaching of some supreme Buddha. They are far superior to Arhats. Now, since heaven alone can be a fit nursery for these future Buddhas, it became necessary to establish a *nexus* with heaven through Maitreya who was already there. It introduced the worship of Maitreya, who was, however, worshipped by all Buddhists, whether belonging to the Northern or the Southern school. But in the Northern school where he was considered as the mediator and redeemer of man, and one who could ensure man's ascent to Heaven, his worship became a part of the cult, and his companionship, the immediate object human aspiration. For, was he not the favoured of denizen of the best of heavens—the Tusht—the heaven of supreme bliss, where perfect love and contentment reigned supreme and into which he alone was privileged to admit his worshippers?

"No words can describe the personal beauty of Maitreya. He declares a law not different from ours. His exquisite voice is soft and pure. Those who hear it, can never tire; those who listen, are never satisfied." (1) This is how Maitreya appeared to the heavenly sage.

The Mahayan cosmogony then comprised of:—(1) The Supreme Buddha; (2) Maitreya as the Buddha-elect; (3) Bodhisatva whose number was unlimited; (4) Pratyek Buddha; (5) Arhats; (6) Bhikkhus; and (7) lay disciples.

(1) *I. Beal's Records (Tr. of Hsuen Tsang's Travels)*

In the Hinyan there was only one Bodhisatv and he was Maitreya—but in the Mahayan the number of Bodhisatvas was unlimited ; in addition to which, they created an attractive saintship for the laity—the Pratyek Buddhs,—both of whom being candidates for the Buddhship, its number had to be enlarged and as the number of the Bodhisatvas was unlimited, so were the Buddhs who may all appear even in the present age of the world. They also paved an easy way to the attainment of Buddhhood by the practice of the six (or ten) transcendental virtues called Paramitas ⁽¹⁾ i.e., virtues which enabled one to cross over to Paradise. They were—

- (1) Generosity or the giving of (*Dan*) charity to all who ask—even the sacrificing of life or limb for others ;
- (2) Virtue or moral conduct (*Shil*) ;
- (3) Patience or tolerance (*Shanti*) ;
- (4) Fortitude or energy (*Virya*) ;
- (5) Transcendental wisdom (*Prajna-Panna*) ;
- (6) Suppression of desire (*Nishkamnekkhamma*).

To which are added—

- (7) Truth (*Satya*) ;
- (8) Steadfast Resolution (*Adhishtan*) ;
- (9) Good-will or kindness (*Maitreya*) ;
- (10) Absolute indifference or imperturbability or apathy (*Upeksha*).

Of these those numbered (4) to (10) except (9) were added afterwards.

Now since the Bodhisatvas were to be in perpetual residence in heaven till they descended as Buddh, it did not gratify the ambition of those who were looking forward to earthly recognition. The fact is that since the Brahmans had their graded priest-craft, the Buddhist aspired to emulate their example and the Tibetan school lost no time in providing each Bodhisatv in heaven a secondary corporeal emanation—

(1) *Paramit*—crossing (over to the other shore).

sometimes called the incarnations or portions of their essence, in a constant succession of human saints whose number was, of course, equally unlimited. As such, *Lalit Vistara* mentions the presence of 32,000 Bodhisatvas in Buddha's assembly in the Jitvahan garden. This is, of course, a pure fiction, but the fact remains that with the growth of the number of Bhikkhus and the severity of their ordeal, there naturally sprang up into their minds a desire for promotion which manifested itself even at the first Council of Buddha's personal disciples, the chief ones of whom were elevated to the status of Bodhisatvship. They were, of course, the first five disciples and others conspicuous by age or distinguished for piety or learning—such as Kashyap, Anand and Upali Nagarjun who was said to be the founder of the Mahayan system and its introduction into Tibet, to whom were added numerous other persons—real or mythical. But the deification of men, howsoever good, could only raise them to the status of saints, whereas Buddhists of the Mahayan school thirsted for the patronage of a real god—one who had never suffered for his sins to be born a man. It led to the next corrupting stage in this school, marked by the adoption of mythical Bodhisatvas and a new triad of them comprise Manjushri⁽¹⁾, Avalokiteshwar⁽²⁾ (also called Padmapani)⁽³⁾ and Vajra-pani (or Vajradhar—the “thunder-handed”)⁽⁴⁾. This was the second Buddhist triad and its trinity was a colourable copy of the Hindu trinity. It appears that this trinity came into existence sometime in the third century and was worshipped when Fa-hien visited Mathura in 400 A.D.

But while the creation of mythical Bodhisatvas, emulating with the Hindu gods their divine attributes, supplied the want of a personal god responsive to prayer and worship, the canonization of historical teachers, even though non-Buddhists, rallied to the banner of neo-Buddhism even those who had previously treated it with lukewarm indifference. In this way

(1) *Manju*—beautiful, lovely, *Shri*—God, “Beautiful Gnd.”

(2) *Avalokit*—*Ava*—Favourably, kindly, *lok*—looking, seeing, *ishwar*—God—“A God who looks kindly.”

(3) *Padma*—Lotus, *Pani*—hand; “Lotus-

handed.”

(4) *Vajra*—“thunder,” *Pani*—hands, “with thunderbolt for hands” *Dhar*—“to hold,” *Vajradhar*: “One who holds the thunder-bolt.”

Gorakhnath, a Hindu missionary to Nepal, is to this day worshipped both by Buddhists and the Hindus of the Punjab, where his tomb exists to this day. He appears to have been a comparatively modern sage; from one account he is said to have been a contemporary of Kabir (1488-1512), but he has none the less passed into the region of mythology, being, according to one legend, born from a lotus, while other legends elevate him to the rank of a god, who, as such, is still worshipped in the hill-tracts of North-west India.

The multiplication of the Buddhs and the Bodhisatvas was probably intended to meet a growing desire for spiritual promotion, stimulated by the attractions of rival systems which did not consider monastic life as the sole avenue to salvation. It was the one objection which Gopi had raised to Buddha's renunciation⁽¹⁾ and it was the one impediment to the free growth of the Buddhist faith. The new school liberalized their creed not only by increasing the prizes, but also by widening the door for the admission of the entrants. Asceticism was no longer the sole passport to salvation. On the contrary, the family and the society were held to be a better training-ground for the spiritual life, and married men and married women were urged to enter on the new discipline by taking the vow to toil towards Buddhhood, by practising the virtues of love, sympathy and service which were far more powerful than austerities. It was no longer necessary for the attainment of Bodhisatvism that one should pass through the purifying ordeal of countless births and re-births. The taking of the vow sufficed to transform the lay devotee to a Bodhisatv. It was merely a higher status within one's grasp, reached by the promise to practise a higher virtue. All were enjoined to cultivate a closer attachment and a deeper devotion (*Bhakti*) towards the Buddhs and the Bodhisatvas. The emptiness of life was stated anew in the *Sunyat*⁽²⁾ philosophy which the Bodhisatvas were enjoined to study. These reforms imparted to the creed a new vigour supplemented by a very large,

(1) See *ante*.

(2) "*Sunya*"—zero, nothing.

varied and attractive literature. The *Sat-Dharm Pundarik* ⁽¹⁾ (i.e., white lotus of the same religion) is one of them and it may be likened to the *Gita* as the scripture of Buddhism.

In making these departures from the orthodox school, the Mahayan school did not formally break away from them; on the other hand, they incorporated their doctrine into their own system. They argued that there were two methods of salvation; in other words, two vehicles to reach the same goal; and two "Bodhis" or forms of knowledge to reach there. These were the Mahayan and the Hinyan—the Great and the Little vehicles or paths to salvation. The one was for ordinary men, the other for those possessing larger talents or higher spiritual powers. For a part of the way the two systems ran parallel; since any one, who possessed the requisite qualifications and answered the prescribed test, became eligible to and obtained the rank of an Arhat. But here the two systems parted company; for, while the "Little way" had many Arhats but only one Bodhisatv and one Buddh, there was no room for further promotion,—which was only possible in the "Great vehicle" with its unlimited Bodhisatvas and Buddhs, the former attainable by any one who took the requisite vow of sanctity and had acquired the requisite knowledge. But this explanation did not suffice to ensure concord between the two systems, which, in point of practice, were inculcating opposing creeds. According to the Hinyan system, Buddh had taught that salvation lay only in the practice of celibacy and chastity. It was not open to one who was content to enjoy the earthly bliss of married life, nor available to one who did not pass to it through the medium of Sangh or the monastic life.

In later years, a compromise was attempted between the two systems by the institution of a third vehicle of salvation called the *Madhyam Yan* ⁽²⁾ or the "Middle Vehicle"; but it does not appear to have lived long enough to have

(1) "Sat"—true, "Dharm"—religion;
"Pundarik"—a lotus flower, especially a
white lotus.

(2) "Madhyam"—"middle,"
"inter-vening";
"Yan"—way or vehicle.

gained many adherents in India, though it is still recognized in Tibet as the *Triyan* or the "Third Vehicle".

An intellectual movement has recently arisen, almost spontaneously in several countries, to revive Buddhism, the main principles of which have begun to attract those who are no longer willing to subscribe to the traditional faith in which they were brought up, but who have begun to test its truth in the light of Reason and the deductions from modern Science. This movement has given rise to a new school of Buddhist thought described as the *Navayan* or "New Vehicle", but which is in reality a mere revival of the Hinyan school, restored to its pristine purity. Several causes have contributed to the revival of interest in Buddhism. Its canon preserved in a language, now extinct, has been brought home to the Europeans through the medium of translation, while its study by savants has in many cases driven them from a curiosity to conviction.

Mahabodhi societies for the study and spread of the Dharm have come into existence in several countries, including Germany, France, England and America, while its catechisms have been translated into several European languages and are attracting a wider circle of earnest students.

And to them, as to many others, a religion of Reason possesses attractions compared to which Revelation is an affront. As has been well said, "Buddhism teaches perfect goodness and wisdom without a personal god, the highest knowledge without revelation, a moral world, order and just retribution, carried out of necessity by reason of the laws of nature and of our own being, continued existence without an immortal soul, eternal bliss without a local heaven, the possibility of redemption without a vicarious redeemer, a salvation at which every one is his own saviour, and which can be attained in this life and on this earth by the exercise of one's own faculties, without prayers, sacrifices, penances, or ceremonies, without ordained priests, without the mediation of saints, and without divine grace."⁽¹⁾

(1) *Message of Buddhism*—84.

CHAPTER X.

BUDDHIST MYTHOLOGY.

As previously stated, the geographical development of the new creed led to its doctrinal and ritual variation, and in process of time, the Religion of Reason became so overlaid with the fungus of dogma that the purity of the creed was eclipsed by the fanciful cosmology, which made no pretence to appeal to human reason nor took any account of the limits of human credulity. All the vacant spaces of Buddha's metaphysics were filled to overflowing by the lively imagination of his disciples. They became the fruitful source of scholastic logomachies, resulting in the multiplication of schools and sects which vied with one another in giving currency to new tenets, buttressed by theories which were passed current in the name of the Master. They appealed to the man whose faith rests on the miraculous and on acts of special intervention. They created a new ecclesiastical system with worlds of their own and planned the universe as they would like it. It has given rise to a complicated system of Buddhist mythology, to which a passing reference becomes necessary.

As has already been seen, Buddhism in its inception started with only a few rules of human conduct ; but in process of time, it assumed a complexity and underwent an expansion, both in the sweep of its subjects and the range of its thought, which has been the prolific source of dogmas, maxims and methods of work of which the present value is merely historical, while they will now only interest the curious or the devout. Such is its view of the cosmic system and the categorization of living beings ; the method for the attainment of Nirvan ; of Arhatship and of the status of Bodhisatv and Buddhhood. All these subjects, of course, belong to later Buddhism, and as such have been the subject of acute polemics ; and a considerable portion of the voluminous literature absorbs these topics of mere ritual, so that only a very brief summary of them is here possible, or is indeed necessary.

In the first place, the Buddhist conception of the universe comprises numberless spheres called *chakravals* each with its own earth, sun, moon, heaven and hells⁽¹⁾. Each of the spheres comprises three regions, the highest being that of *Arupe* or formlessness, the middle one being the region of *Rupe* or form divided into four divisions corresponding to the four stages of *Dhyans*, while the lowest is that of *Kam* inhabited by (1) the four Rulers of the cardinal points; (2) the thirty-three gods; (3) the *Yamas*; (4) the *Tushitas*; (5) *Nirvanratis* and (6) *Parinirmit-vashavartins* and men, *Asuras*, *Pretas*, animals and the hells. Higher in the scale, the *Ruploke* (which, in a wider sense, includes the *Kamloke*) is divided into 16 sections inhabited by the following beings respectively, in the order of descending scale: (1) *Akanittas*; (2) *Suddhasins*; (3) *Suddasas*; (4) *Atappas*; (5) *Arihas*; (6) *Asanutatthas*; (7) *Vehapphalas*; (8) *Subhakinns*; (9) *Appamansubhas*; (10) *Parittasubhas*; (11) *Abhassaras*; (12) *Appamanabhas*; (13) *Paritbhas*; (14) *Mahabrahmans*; (15) *Brahmpurohitis*; (16) *Brahmaparisajjas*. The abodes of the last three are attained by those who exercise the three degrees of the first *Dhyan* severally, the next three by proficiency in the second *Dhyan*, the next three by adepts in the third *Dhyan*, the next two by those who have attained proficiency in the fourth *Dhyan*, while the remaining five are reserved for the *Anagamins*. These are varied in the *Mahayan* texts where the highest order is assigned to *Akinshthas*, *Sudarshans*, *Sudrasas*, *Atapas* and *Avrhas*, followed by *Vrihatphals*, *Punyaprasavas*, *Anabhrakas*, the third class comprising *Shubhakritshas*, *Apramansubhas* and *Parittasubhas*, the fourth—*Abhasvars*, *Apramanbhas* and *Parittabhas*; while the lowest and the last is made up of *Brahmakayiks*—*Mahabrahmans*, *Brahmpurohitas* and *Brahmaparisadyas*.

The highest region, the *Arupeloke* is divided into four degrees, viz., (1) Place of Infinity of Space, (2) Place of Infinity of Consciousness, (3) Place of Nothingness, (4) Place of neither consciousness nor unconsciousness.

⁽¹⁾ For details see Burnouff *Intro. Manual of Buddhism* 1 ff; Waddell—*Childers' S.V. Sattloks*; Hardy's *Tibetan Buddhism*, 77—104.

The earth itself is described as a sphere in the centre of which stands Mount Meru ⁽¹⁾ around which are the principal mountains (*Kulachals*) and beyond these the four continents, or Mahāvīps—namely, Uttarakuru, the country of the Hyperboreans; Jambudvīp or India which is to the South of Meru; Godaniya or Apar Godana ⁽²⁾ to the West; and Purvavideh ⁽³⁾ to the East.

There are thirty-one abodes of living beings, each equipped with its own heaven and hell; but the principal hells are eight in number and known by the names of Sanjiva, Kalsutra, Sanghat, Raurav, Mahaurav, Tapan, Pratapan and Avisi ⁽⁴⁾. These are the eight hot hells to which the old Mahayans add an equal number of cold hells, viz., Arbud, Nirabud, Atat, Hahu, Huhav, Utpal, Padm and Mahapadm; while in the Pali canon, the number grows by a few more, and in the later Northern canon, the number of hells is still greater.

Above the hells, is placed the animal kingdom or brute creation; above whom is the abode of Prets, ghosts, spectres: while higher than these is the abode of Asurs, demons, conspicuous among the latter being Rahu or the demon of Eclipse.

The hells together with the next three worlds constitute the four *Aphayalokes* or places of suffering.

But the thirty-one worlds above referred to are not all; since, there is still another world in which living beings are graded according to their spiritual merit; but this gradation is merely temporary, since they are liable to elevation or degradation by dint of Karm—the only exceptions made being in the case of (1) Buddhs, (2) Pratyek Buddhs, and (3) the Arhats who are certain of reaching the Parinirvan. These three, therefore, occupy the highest place in this world; and next to them stand the (4) Devas, (5) Brahmas, (6) Gandharvs (the celestial musicians), (7) Garuds (winged beings), (8) Nags (Snake-shaped beings resembling clouds), (9) Yakshas, (10) Kumbhands (goblins), (11) Asurs (demons), (12) Rakshas (giants or monsters), (13)

(1) Also called *Sumeru*; and in Pali—*Sineru*.

(2) *P. Aparā Goyana*.

(3) *P. Pubba-videh*.

(4) For detailed description of these hells see *Anguttar Nikay* (Ed. R. Morris Lond. 1885-1888) 141 ff; *Mahāvastu* (Ed. E. Senart Paris I—1882. II—1890) I, 7 ff.

Prets (ghosts, and goblins) and (14) the denizens of hell⁽¹⁾. Nirvan being the final goal of all beings, the canon prescribes the method by which it is attainable. It requires the practice of constant spiritual exercise, meditation and contemplation, following the directions prescribed by the several schools. Overlooking their differences, they all require as a preparatory stage, the cultivation of four *Bhavanas* (1) the cherishing of the sentiments of *Maitri*, (benevolence), (2) *Karuna* (compassion), (3) *Mudita* (cheerfulness) and (4) *Upeksha* (equanimity, composure), to which a fifth *Bhavana* is sometimes added. viz., *Ashubhbhavana* (the realisation of the loathsomeness of the body)⁽²⁾ which comprises ten notions, arising from the contemplation of a dead body: bloated (*Uddhumatak*); blackish (*Vinilak*); festering (*Vipubhak*); fissured from decay (*Vichhiḍḍak*); gnawed by animals (*Vikkhayitak*); scattered (*Vikkhitak*); injured and scattered (*Hatvikkhitak*); bloody (*Lohitak*); full of worms (*Pulavak*); bones (*Athhik*).

These four *Bhavanas* are the first step to the practice of Yoga. Those who practise them begin to live in the spiritual world (*Brahmavihar*)⁽³⁾. The four *Brahmavihars* and the ten *Ashubhs* are only a part of the forty exercises or *Kammatthans*, (one hundred and eight according to the *Lalit Vistar*)⁽⁴⁾. The next ten operations relate to the ten objects on which the attention at this exercise must be fixed successively: earth, water, fire, air, blue, yellow, red, white, light, and space or ether.

The Mahayans vary the order of contemplation. The forty exercises further include the ten kinds of recollections⁽⁵⁾ or cogitations on the Buddh, the Dharm, the Sangh; morality, renunciation (*tyag*), the gods; death, the body; the control of inspiration and expiration (*anapansmriti*); and quietude.⁽⁶⁾ *Anapansmriti* is a valued *Samadhi* and consists in not only regulating the breath, but also in fixing the mind intensely on one's own breathing, while the mind is fixed on certain set subjects

(1) In *Mahavyutpatti* (St. Petersburg 1887), 166, the order is different.

(2) But in this case *Bhavana* bears a different meaning—viz., conception, realisation—*asubhavana*, or *asubhupratyaveksh*. *Majjhim-Nikay* (Ed. Trenckner. Lond. 1887) 434.

(3) Also *Apraman*, P. *Appamanna*.

(4) 34 ff.

(5) *Anusmriti*; P. *Anussatti*.

(6) *Anguttar Nikay* (Ed. Morris Lond. 1885-1888) 42 *Lalit Vistar* (Ed. R. L. Mitra) 34; *Mahavyutpatti* (St. Petersburg 1887) 51; *Dharm Sangrah* (Oxford 1885) S. *Loc. note*.

of reflection. It is only by this means that one is able to reach the region of *Arupe* or formlessness belonging to the four incorporeal Brahmlokes;—the place of infinite space ⁽¹⁾, the place of infinity of clear consciousness ⁽²⁾, that of nothingness ⁽³⁾ or the unconsciousness ⁽⁴⁾. The final stage is reached with the cessation of consciousness, when the state of emancipation or deliverance (*Vimoksh*) is reached. These four stages of meditation produce the four stages of ecstasy which Childers has thus described: "The priest concentrates his mind upon a single thought. Gradually his soul becomes filled with a supernatural ecstasy and serenity, while his mind still reasons upon and investigates the subject chosen for contemplation; this is the first Jhan (*Ādhyāna*). Still fixing his thoughts upon the same subject, he then frees his mind from reasoning and investigation, while the ecstasy and serenity remain, and this is the second Jhan. Next, his thoughts still fixed as before, he divests himself of ecstasy, and attains the third Jhan, in which is a state of tranquil serenity. Lastly he passes to the fourth Jhan in which the mind, exalted and purified, is indifferent to all emotions, alike of pleasure and of pain." ⁽⁵⁾ Each of the first three *Ādhyānas* is sub-divided into three degrees, the inferior, the medial and the superior meditation. The attainment of the first *Ādhyāna* gives the power of working miracles. In general, the *Ādhyānas* secure access of the soul to the sixteen corporeal Brahmlokes, the nature of which depends upon the proficiency in the *Ādhyāna*.

The *Yoge* of the Buddhists is little distinguishable from that of the Brahmans. The former, however, refer to it as ■ thing apart and distinguish *Yoge* from *Samādhi*, of which several are described in the Mahayan canon. But the substratum of the idea, whether *Yoge*, *Ādhyāna*, or *Samādhi*, is the same viz., intense meditation conducive to the production of spiritual ecstasy which results in the attainment of Nirvan. There are stages in spiritual evolution. Those who have reached the fourth and the highest stage of that path are called Arhats. They become possessed of faculties, far superior to those of common

(1) *Akashanāṇḍīyāna*; P. *Akasanan-kāyāna*

(2) *Vijñānānāṇḍī*.

(3) *Ākincanai*.

(4) *Naivaggyan—nānan—Gūyatan*.

■ *Pali Dictionary* 189.

mortals. In the first place, they possess four sorts of comprehension regarding the meaning of a text or subject (*Arth*), the Law (the *Dharm*) ; and all things taught by Buddha ; Exegesis, (*Nirukti*) ; and readiness in discussing and expounding the same.

Arhats are of two kinds, the contemplative philosopher (*Sukhavipasak*) and one devoted to quietude (*Samathayanik*). Their outstanding merit is wisdom (*Prajna*) and it is by wisdom that the Arhat crosses the ocean of Existence. Hence he is called "Prajnavimukta". For his wisdom, the Arhat is also called the Arya ; and he is also called "Shravak" *par excellence* of Buddha ; as also "*Aryashravak*" (an honorific term to denote a wise and pious Believer), though the term "Shravak" was somewhat loosely used to designate any pious believer ⁽¹⁾ and the Mahayanists called the Buddhists of the older school (*Hinyan*) by that name. They classify all Buddhists into three classes, according to the vehicle (*Yan*) they use, and the exercises they go through : (1) the Yan of the Shravaks which is the lowest, (2) the Pratyek Buddha and (3) the Bodhisatv ; but the classification seems really to proceed upon a different line, since while the term Shravak Yan is applied to the Sthavirs or Buddhists of the orthodox school, the second and the third nomenclatures are applied to the solitary contemplative philosophers and the accomplished teachers and preachers respectively. But, since all are on the same path to Nirvan, they are all in one sense equal, though the distinction between the Arhats, Pratyek Buddha and the Buddha is marked in the Mahayan school, in which the Arhat holds a position of marked inferiority to the Pratyek Buddha, while the latter is only inferior to the Buddha in that he is not omniscient like Buddha, and it is in the nature of things that he cannot live at the same time as Buddha.

Higher in the scale of spirituality and nearer to Buddha in qualitative proximity stands the Bodhisatv. He is a Buddha *in posse*, but his faculty has not yet matured into perfect sensibleness (*Samyak-Sambodhi*). He is a potential intelligence

(1) So in *Anguttar Nikay*, 210 the *Arya Shravaks* are exhorted to keep the Sabbath in a worthy manner : here the word can only mean a Believer.

evolved in three stages: (1) that of aspiration (*Abhinihar*); (2) of the prediction (*Vyakaran*) by the Tathagat of the period that the Saint shall once become a Buddh; (3) of the tumultuous acclamation at the approach of his last birth (*Halahal*). In the Mahayan there are four stages in his path: (1) the original course (*prakritikar*); (2) the course of the vow or firm resolution (*Pranidhan*); (3) the course pursued in accordance with the plighted vow (*Anuhom*); and (4) the steadfast course in which there is no turning back (*Anivartan*).⁽¹⁾ A Bodhisatv is only a promoted Arhat, but with this difference that while the Arhat is inactive, the Bodhisatv is active and conspicuous for his high-mindedness and compassionateness. The one is passionless, the other—compassionate. The Bodhisatv possesses ten perfect virtues: alms-giving (*Dan*), Morality (*Sheel*), renunciation (*Nekhamm*), wisdom (*Panna*), energy (*Virya*), forbearance (*Shanti*), truthfulness (*Satya*), charity (*Mett* or *Metti*), and indifference or equanimity (*Upeksha*), each of them being divided into three degrees. But these are moral virtues added to which the Bodhisatv must evince such intellectual qualities as are conducive to enlightenment. It is only by passing through numerous and even innumerable existences, and by living in higher and lower stages that a person can attain the high degree of Bodhisatv, which is the sole avenue for exaltation into Buddhhood. They are 37 in number, but there are qualities which are not special to him, since he shares them equally with Arhats. They fall into seven heads:—

- (1) Four kinds of Smartupastan: presentness of memory, thoughtfulness (1) in regard to the body;
(2) to sensation; (3) to rising thoughts; and
(4) to Dharm.
- (2) Four kinds of application, e.g., right exertion etc.
- (3) Four kinds of miraculous power.
- (4) Five mental energies.
(*Indriyas*): Faith, energy, memory or thoughtfulness, concentration of mind and wisdom.
- (5) Five mental forces (*Bals*) as in the last, but more powerful.

(1) *Mahavastu*, 1—46 ff.

(6) Seven constituents of Bodhi, to wit: memory, investigation, energy, contentment, calm, concentration of the mind, contemplation, and indifference or equanimity.

(7) Eightfold path of the Arya.

Bodhisatvas enjoy numerous immunities and prerogatives proportionate to their duties. They develop into Buddhs who, as the Supreme Beings in the Buddhist hierarchy, are according to the Mahayan school numerous; each possessing 216 auspicious marks on his feet, 108 on each foot, of which 32 marks he shares with Chakravartis, Arhats and other eminent sages⁽¹⁾. It is the characteristic of all Buddhs that they survey with their Divine eye the world six times every day⁽²⁾. They possess certain special mental qualities, ten forces, eighteen Dharmas and four points of self-confidence (*Vaisharadyas*).

The forces (or *Bals*) are sometimes said to be only four or five or seven, but as many as ten must be found in a Buddh. These ten forces arm them with (1) Knowledge of what is fit or unfit; (2) of the necessary consequence of Karm; (3) of the right path to any end; (4) of the elements; (5) of the inclination of beings; (6) of the relative powers of the organs; (7) of all degrees of meditations and ecstasy; (8) as well as their power to purify and fortify the mind; (9) knowledge of previous births; (10) and a power to remove moral corruption.

Of all Buddhs, Gautam was the Buddh *par excellence* and he was as great in body as he was great in mind; his towering figure having measured 12 cubit, or according to another account 11 cubit; his foot alone measuring more than 5 feet in length and 2½ feet in breadth, of which an imprint (*Shripad*) is left on Adam's peak in Ceylon⁽³⁾. All Buddhs are alike, except that they differ from the Tathagat in size and longevity. Gautam was the twenty-fifth of the race, no less than twenty-four Buddhs having preceded him. The Buddh next to appear as

(1) *Sutta Nipat* (Fanehal, Lond. 1884) S. B. E. 102; *Brihat Samhita* Ch. 69.

(2) *Divyadhan* (Camb.), 95.

(3) Hardy: *Manual of Buddhism* 364 ff; Burnouf: *Le Lotus de la bonne loi* (Paris 1852) 622.

predicated by Gautam himself⁽¹⁾ is Maitreya (*Metteya*) surnamed 'Ajit' who is at present reposing as Bodhisatv in the Tushit heaven.

As an exception to the rule, the Mahayanists speak of five Dhyani Buddhs, who are eternal and were never Bodhisatvas. They have been provided with five consorts. Their names and those of their female counter-parts are as follows :—

Vairochana	Vajradhat Visvri
Akshobhya	Lochana
Ratnasambhav	Mamaki
Amitabha	Pandura
Amoghasiddhi	Tara

The question whether a Buddh is a man or a god is answered by the Northern school in the negative. This question is said to have been put to Gautam himself and answered by him as follows :—

"Once upon a time the Brahman Dona, seeing Tathagat sitting at the foot of a tree asked him—

"Are you a Dev?"

And the Blessed One answered—"I am not."

"Are you a Gandharv?" "I am not."

"Are you a Yaksh?" "I am not."

"Are you a man?" "I am not."

"Who then are you?" "I am a Buddh."

Buddh is, therefore, only human in form, but not human in esse⁽²⁾.

(1) *Milindu—Panho* (Lond. 1880) 217.

(2) *Anguttar Nikay*, 11-33.

CHAPTER XI.

RULES OF THE BROTHERHOOD.

The Buddhist liturgy is an important part of the Buddhist religion. When Buddha himself was preaching his gospel, he had divided his converts into two classes—the monks, and the lay followers. The former were to retire from the world, were pledged to life-long celibacy and chastity, a life of abject penury passed in a monastery or an open arbour and one subject to close and rigorous discipline.

The lay brethren were subject to no similar restraint. They were, however, like any other convert, to practise the creed embodied in the well-known formula—"Of all objects which proceed from a cause, the Tathagat has explained the cause, and He has explained their cessation also; this is the doctrine of the great Saman"⁽¹⁾. When Buddha had first launched his doctrine, he did not contemplate the enlistment of lay converts who were, however, from the very first, forced upon him by the pressure of circumstances. But they were not welcome to him. But the fact is, all his most influential patrons and benefactors were laymen. Bimbeshwar, King of Magadh, and his son Ajatsatru, were his lay followers; and so was the King of Koushal; and so indeed were his numerous benefactors, men and women who gave him and his disciples a warm reception, acted as lay evangelists and built for them Vihars (monasteries), sumptuously equipped with lecture-halls and meeting-places. Buddha must have early discovered the impossibility of his tenet as he originally preached it.

His whole life shows him to be readily responsive to public opinions. It is a set phrase in his discourses that he desired his doctrine to bring converts. Where was he to obtain them from, if he had succeeded too well in inducing the husbands to abandon

their wives, and the wives their husbands, and both to abjure their wordly pursuits and the accumulation of wealth? Where would he get the children to become the boy-pupils, and the boy-pupils to become monks? And whom would the monks have begged for their living and what would become of the world, if all of them were converted to his faith, strictly obeyed his behests and quitted the world to enter Nirvan? And who would then be left to follow his religion? His teaching, ■ literally followed, would soon have ended in national mendicancy. That it ended in a national cataclysm which wiped out his family and his race, was a small disaster, compared to the awful fate to which his own Order and his Sangh would have been exposed. Insistence upon a perpetual celibacy and ragged penury was good enough for the monks who practised religion, as his Bhikkhus did, to establish the reality of an ideal; but it was a counsel of perfection to the masses; and the masses knew it; and put it to Buddh⁽¹⁾ who was able to return no better answer, beyond venturing the one that he was preaching the gospel of truth⁽²⁾.

But the very truth to which he appealed, postulated the existence of a living world, in which the law of birth and death maintained a succession of lives which offered a field for man's elevation and perfection. How was it possible unless men married and perpetuated their race? Buddh knew that both under the ancient law and by an inveterate usage, people in India married early and that the begetting of a son to continue the family was heightened into a religious duty. He never attacked the system. It is doubtful if he ever even adverted to it. His insistence upon celibacy must then have been relaxed as soon as he gave expression to his doctrine. And the fact—that he went on enlisting lay disciples, shows that he soon became inured to the new phase of his teaching and acquiesced in it, though he did not cease to denounce it. "A wise man should avoid married life⁽³⁾, as if it were a burning pit of live coals." Married life is at times ■ burning pit of live coals but it is so for other reasons. Life itself would be

(1) *M. V.*, I—25-5, 13 S.B.E. 150.

(2) *M. V.*, I—25-5, 6; 13 S.B.E. 150, 151.

(3) *Abrahma Chariyam*—Non-celibacy,—*Dhammika Sutra*, 21.

reduced to that state, if men never married. It may be that "Full of hindrances is married life, defiled by passion. How can one who dwells at home, live the higher life in all its purity"(¹). The question answers itself—why not?

The fact, however, remains that lay converts did not enter into the Buddhistic system of conversion. And Buddha, therefore, made no provision for their conversion, though in point of practice they had probably to subscribe to the twenty-four slylables of the three refuges (²)—namely submission to Buddha (in person), his law (Dharm) and Order (Sangh). But that alone would have over-committed him to his faith, since all the three had enjoined on celibacy and a cenobitic life. But these pre-requisites of the creed were condoned in their case, and these conditions became inapplicable. How they were to be taught and what were the initiatory vows binding on them? It may be supposed that they were bound to avoid the five gross sins—that is, they were not to kill, steal, drink, lie or commit adultery. But these had already been the part of the Hindu ethics. The fact is that in the early Buddhist system lay brethren were admitted only, as it were, by a side-door. They were accordingly not classed as Shravaks (hearers) but were simply Upasaks, or in the case of women—Upasikas. They could not be called disciples of Buddha, in the real sense of the word; but none the less they were classed and treated as Associate Members of the brotherhood.

And this *lacuna* in his system created a difficulty which he had to overcome, and did, for the time, overcome by declaring: "I would magnify, O brethren, the Supreme Attainment, either in a layman or in the recluse, whether he be a layman, O brethren, or a recluse; the man who has reached the Supreme Attainment shall overcome all the difficulties inherent therein, and shall win his way even to the excellent condition of Arhatship." Milinda put this very question to Nagzen. He asked that if the Path to the Supreme Attainment was alike open both to the layman and the monk why should one abjure the pleasures of life and

(¹) *Tevijja Sutta*—47; 11 S.B.E. 187.

and *Saran*—submission.

(²) *Prisaran*—*Pr*—three;

become a monk?—to which Nagsen replied, that while the Path was alike open to both, the monk completed it more quickly because of the greater merit of his renunciation⁽¹⁾.

In the earlier stages of development of the Mahayan school, a lay devotee was confronted with another difficulty. His way to Arhatship either lay through monk-hood or his destination upon the attainment of Arhatship was *Pari-Nirvan*, which laymen did not care to enter; for, what they were seeking was some kind of paradise, but not a paradise which they understood to be akin to extinction. However, these were later difficulties which did not confront the Teacher or his immediate disciples. The new religion was on trial and the gateway to it had to be made as wide as possible. Buddha did not insist, nor did the conversion imply that the convert should entirely break away from the old faith. His doctrine was then a purely ethical doctrine, open alike to all including Hindus, who did not cease to be Hindus because they had become converts to his faith. And this tolerance of other creeds was published by Ashoke in his twelfth edict: "The beloved of the gods honours all forms of religious faiths and no reviling of that of others." But it did not prevent Buddha from reviling the Brahman⁽²⁾ or the castes into which he cut up society. It was the essential ground-work for his system and he could not help it.

Apart from the lay adherents, the whole spirit of his teaching proceeded on the abandonment of all worldly ties, on the part of those who thirsted for salvation through the medium of his doctrine. They were his Bhikkhus who formed the Sangh, or the congregation of his Church. And it is to them that we must turn in order to understand the practical side of his teaching. They constituted the Order, the third force in his trinity to which technically all converts, but in reality all Bhikkhus had to conform. His Order was his church, his ecclesiastical organization for the practice and propagation of his doctrine. The brotherhood collectively possessed the power

(1) *Questions of King Milinda* IV—
6-16; 36 S.B.E. 56-59.

(2) See "*The Brahman*" *Dhammapadāhi*
XXXI—383-423; 10 S.B.E. 90-96.

and wielded the authority of his church. So long as he was alive, he, of course, was its Head. But he had abstained from arranging for his successor. On the other hand, he had again and again made it clear, that the authority which he wielded had passed to the Sangh and that the Sangh as such was thenceforth his successor.

The Sangh in his time had developed into a powerful organization and influence. This he effected within a very short time by offering equality of status to all, high or low, rich or poor, men or women—a haven of refuge to all who felt oppressed by the troubles of life. Buddha began his ministry in a limited area. Before long his doctrine had attracted numerous adherents from all parts of the country and from every direction of the compass. His success was instantaneous and signal; but never in his wildest dreams could the founder of Buddhism have expected that within a few hundred years of his demise, his system would displace every religion in Asia and become a world-force for the spiritual advancement of mankind. What he then planned was, therefore, a plan intended for the immediate purpose of his comparatively small following and the natural expansion which he expected to remain limited to Aryavart—the adopted home of the Aryan race in India. But it had soon out-grown that limit even in his own life-time and the Sangh, the Master had to deal with, was “the Sangh of the four directions”⁽¹⁾. But nevertheless the expanded Sangh was still a single congregation and its members only brethren and nothing more.

In creating this confederation of monks, Buddha was making a striking departure from the institutions by which he must have been surrounded. He was, as it were, establishing a republic in the midst of monarchies. And their influence did not take long to give a similar turn to his Sangh.

But in Buddha's own time there was no gradation of monks—not even the gradation into “Chiefs” and “Elders,” which sprang up immediately after his death. They then became

⁽¹⁾ *Mahavagga*, VIII—27-5; 17 S.B.E. 245.

also known as *Shravaks* or "hearers," that ■ to say, those who had heard the word from the Master's own lips, *Sthavirs* or *Ayushmas* ("Those possessing life") and were all promoted to the rank of *Arhats*.

Buddh called all his disciples (other than lay-followers who do not count) *Bhikshus*, beggars or mendicants, corrupted into the Pali *Bhikkhus*, but they were also known as *Shramans* (Pali *Samners*, *Samans*) that is "workers" or *Nirgranthas* or "persons without ties."

As was to be expected, originally every suppliant for admission to the order was welcome and received, as a matter of course without any formal ceremony; the only form of admission which Buddh used was use of the word "*Ehi*" which meant "come" or "follow me." It was sufficient for conversion. There was no limit as to age. But he soon found that his *Bhikkhu* urchins started beggary with their fathers and the people began to complain of indiscriminate beggary. He thereupon made a rule that no person under the age of fifteen should, except if he be a cow-keeper⁽¹⁾, be eligible for monk-hood⁽²⁾ and he was not to be ordained without his parent's consent⁽³⁾, and in all cases persons guilty of any crime⁽⁴⁾, or below twenty⁽⁵⁾ were ineligible for ordination as *Bhikkhus*. Nor were eligible, persons guilty of murder⁽⁶⁾, robbery⁽⁷⁾ or one who has broken jail⁽⁸⁾ a debtor⁽⁹⁾ or one who has been punished by scourging⁽¹⁰⁾, is a eunuch⁽¹¹⁾, a slave or one afflicted with certain diseases or suffering from other disabilities referred to in the following catechism, which the suppliant had to answer:

Are you afflicted with the following diseases?—leprosy, boils, dry leprosy, consumption, and fits?

Are you a man?

Are you a male?

(1) *Mahavagga* I—51; 13 S.B.E. 204, 205.

(2) *Ib.* I—50; 13 S.B.E. 204.

(3) *Ib.* I—54; 13 S.B.E. 209, 210.

(4) *See ante*,—Introduction.

(5) *MV*—I-49-6.

(6) I-64, 65, 66; 13 S.B.E. 219-221.

(7) *Ib.*—I-41 13 S.B.E. 196, 198.

(8) *Ib.*—I-42; 13 S.B.E. 197.

(9) *Ib.* I-46; 13 S.B.E. 199.

(10) *Ib.* I-44; 13 S.B.E. 198.

(11) *Ib.* I-61; 13 S.B.E. 215.

Are you a free man ?

Have you no debts ?

Are you not in the royal service ?

Have your father and mother given their consent ?

Are you full twenty years old ?

Are your alms-bowl and robes in due state ?

What is your name ?

What is your Upadhya's name ? ⁽¹⁾

The initiatory ceremony called the *Prabhag*⁽²⁾ like the ceremony of entry into the order of full monk-hood called *Upasampad*—consisted in repeating thrice each line of the formula :—

I take my refuge in the Buddh.

I take my refuge in the Dharm ("The law").

I take my refuge in the Sangh.

By the time this ceremony became necessary, the order had out-grown the personal attention of the Founder, who delegated his power of initiation and elevation to the Bhikkhu rank to the Bhikkhus already ordained⁽³⁾. Before the performance of either ceremony, that is, before the supplicant was presented for initiation, he had had to get his hair and beard cut off ; put on the yellow robes , adjust his upper robe so as to cover one shoulder ; he then saluted the feet of the ordaining Bhikkhu with his head, and to sit down squatting, and then raising his joined hands repeated the formula⁽⁴⁾. The ordaining Bhikkhu then said, "Come, O Bhikkhu, well-taught in the doctrine, lead a holy life for the sake of the complete extinction of suffering"⁽⁵⁾.

A Bhikkhu could ordinarily receive no more than two pupils for training⁽⁶⁾. The pupil must treat his preceptor (*Upadhya*) as his father and serve him loyally during his novi-

(1) *M.V.* 1-76 ; 13 *S.B.E.* 230.

(2) *Ib.* 1-12 ; 13 *S.B.E.* 114, 115.

(3) *Ib.* 1-12-3 ; 13 *S.B.E.* 115.

(4) *M.V.* 1-12-3 ; 13 *S.B.E.* 115.

(5) *Ib.* 1-25-4 ; 13 *S.B.E.* 150.

(6) *Ib.* 1-55 ; 13 *S.B.E.* 211.

tiate. He must sweep his cell, make his bed, dust and beat his carpet, air his beddings, prepare his bath, put away his alms-bowl and the robe. If he was contumacious or negligent or otherwise misbehaved⁽¹⁾, he could be turned out. The pupil was entitled to select his own preceptor⁽²⁾. The latter had to impart to him spiritual knowledge by exhortation and instruction, provide him with an alms-bowl and attend on him in sickness. No one could be ordained a Bhikkhu without the previous sanction of the Sangh or without his own application for ordination⁽³⁾. Bhikkhus were to be both learned as well as pious; and only those who had completed ten or more years of service were entitled to impart instruction.

Upon his ordination, the Bhikkhu became a regular member of the order, and subject to its superintendence. All questions affecting him or in relation to him, were decided by the Sangh. Between him and his Sangh there was no authority to control his action. Elaborate rules for the conduct of meetings of the Sangh were drawn up and subsequently added to or varied.

These detailed rules underwent material changes as the Sanghs became more autonomous and subject to a graded hierarchy. In foreign countries, as for example—in Tibet and China, they naturally followed a line of development adapted to the genius of the people.

As previously stated, the usual course of instruction for a novice is five years and that for a Bhikkhu ten years, if he wishes to attain to the degree of a teacher (Upādhyā). This period is spent in the memorizing of the religious precepts and in their practice under the supervision of the Bhikkhus and the Upādhyās respectively. But the education continues, and those who aspire to the higher degree of Arhatship or to enter the charmed circle of Bodhisatvas have to show their proficiency by the acquisition of higher knowledge and the attainment of higher sanctity of which the Sangh is the sole

(1) *M.V.*—1.60; ■ *S.B.E.* 215.
(2) *Ib.*—1—25-7; ■ *S.B.E.* 154.

(3) *Ib.*—1.20-2; 13 *S.B.E.* 170, 171.

judge, except in countries where that authority has become vested in the dignitaries of the church. But these are details. The principles of Buddhism have to be mastered by all alike. Those principles are stated in the ascending scale of ethical importance to be discussed later.

All Bhikkhus had to conform to a strict disciplinary observance of the rules, such as the following:—The wearing of garments consisting of three lengths of orange-coloured rags. These were to be collected from the rubbish-heaps or the cemeteries but were later permitted to be obtained by begging or as gifts from the laity; but cloth so obtained, if entire, had to be torn up into three pieces to destroy its marketable value and the rags sewn up. They are called *Trishivar*, comprising *Antarvasak*, *Uttarsang* and *Sanghati*. They were at one time dyed in cow-dung, but latterly in red ochre. It is the colour of the garments of ascetics of other persuasions, e.g., Hindu and Islam. The *Antarvasak* was a low shirt, reaching up to the loins to which it was fastened with a girdle. The *Uttarsang* covered the breast and shoulders and reached down up to the knees, while the *Sanghati* was a cloak and so called because it was folded and composite. The Bhikkhus' other possessions were an alms-bowl or pot, a girdle, a razor, a needle, a water-strainer and a staff. The brethren shaved each other once a fortnight. The rosary appears to have completed their equipment at a later stage.

It was considered a pious act for the lay-followers to present garments to the Sangh. The Sangh lived in the monasteries called *Sangharam* to which was attached a chapel called *Vihar*—a name which in the course of time began to be applied to the whole monastic establishment.

The Bhikkhus were to hold and possess no goods except the three cloths, a girdle, a begging-bowl, a water-strainer to prevent the swallowing of smaller life; a razor and a needle for the mending of their cloths. They must live upon such food as was thrown into their bowls in their rounds from house to house, taking only what is voluntarily offered without ever asking for anything. The food so collected must be

eaten before noon, and no other meal taken, save in case of sickness. They must observe fasts on four prescribed days. They must halt at one place during the rains (*Vassa*), from full moon of *Asarh* (June—July) till the close of the rainy season, i.e., middle of October. They must refrain from a recumbent posture under all circumstances, and they must visit cremation-grounds for meditation on the corruption of the body.

Bhikkhus were to eat the cooked food offered; but ■ uncooked food was received, they were free to cook it. Meat-diet was permitted in case of sickness, even the use of raw flesh and of blood⁽¹⁾; on other occasions, any meat except the flesh of lions, tigers, hyenas, serpents, elephants and horses⁽²⁾.

Food that might be taken and that prohibited are all set out with meticulous care; and so too, as regards garments, residence, medicine, and the rest.

The Bhikkhu had to confess to all his sins serious and trivial—those for which he might have to perform a penance or be let off with admonition and a warning. Meetings of the Sangh were formerly held twice a month on the sacred days of the full and new moon. The meetings were held of such members of the congregation as were present; but five was a quorum. This chapter met to receive confessions. At the commencement of the chapter, a brother elected to conduct the proceedings first proclaimed: "Let the reverend brethren announce their purity and I will rehearse the *pati-moksh*."

The brethren exclaimed: "We all gladly give ear and do attend!" Then he repeated thrice the following general question: "Whosoever have incurred a fault let him declare it! ■ no fault has been incurred, it is meet to keep silence!" He then warned the members that if any one held silence, though he had incurred a fault, he is guilty of uttering a conscious lie. He again repeated thrice: "Are you pure in

(1) *M.V.* VI—10-2; 17 *S.B.E.* 49.

(2) *M.V.* VI—23; 17 *S.B.E.* 80-86.

this matter?" A second time do I question you, "Are you pure in this matter?" A third time do I question you, "Are you pure in this matter?"

If no one replied; he ended thus:—

"The venerable ones are pure herein. Therefore, do they keep silence. Thus I understand.(1)"

He then recited the rules of conduct and purity and the chapter then transacted other business and dispersed. If any brother made a confession of his offence, the Sangh prescribed the appropriate penalty or penance in accordance with the gravity of the offence. Trivial offenders were let off with a warning; others would be prescribed a penalty or deprived of the privilege of Association.

From these comparatively small divergences, there has grown up a system, which though called Buddhist, embraces within its ambit systems widely diverse and on essential points contradictory. Only a brief summary of these systems can be attempted here.

Buddhism in Tibet—The development of Buddhism in Tibet illustrates its evolution along the line into which the force of local beliefs and customs diverted it. Before the introduction of Buddhism, the religion of Tibet(2) called 'Bhot' in the Sanskrit texts, was one of Nature and demon-worship. It was a kind of Shamanism called Bon.

It proceeded upon the view that Nature teemed with spirits, good and bad, and they influenced the whole course of Nature. They influenced man as much as the lower animals and controlled all their actions. Now as man was weak and ignorant and not conversant with their views and antics, it became necessary to call the aid of the Shamans or wizard-priests and exorcise them by magical practices. The Shamans laid claim to possess a special knowledge of them and were able to subdue storms, prevent pestilence and avert all calamities. They understood omens and could

(1) *Pati Mokkha* 13 S.B.E. 1, 2.

(2) Called in *Sk. Bhot* 1 *Bod*, *Bhot*, *Bot*.

predict the future by watching the flight of birds, examining the shoulder-blades of sheep and other devices which gave them timely warnings.

It was at this stage of their religious history that Buddhism penetrated Tibet. It readily welcomed and adopted it. But it did not take long for the Shamans to adapt it to their existing beliefs, the result being a form of Buddhism, which though nominally drawn both from the Mahayan and Hinayan systems of Indian Buddhism, was transformed into altogether a new system, in which the old magic became blended with Buddhism and the Shiv-worship and controlled by a hierarchy, of which the chief priests were called the Lamas and their chief the Avtar Lama or Dalai Lama⁽¹⁾ called by the Tibetans Ragyamthso Pinpochi, known to outsiders as the Supreme or Grand Lama.

The Tibetan Buddhism and the Chinese Buddhism present some analogy to the Mahayan and the Hinayan schools of Indian Buddhism. The Lamas exist in both countries; but, while in the one case there are dignitaries superior to the Lamas, Chinese Buddhism recognizes no superior rank beyond that of the Head Lama of the great monastery at Peking, to whom all Lamas in that country are subordinate. In Japan there are no Lamas; but as in Tibet, Buddhism was adapted to the existing beliefs; so it was in China. In the former an ethical system founded by Confucius became assimilated with Buddhism; while its off-shoot Shintoism in Japan became merged into the new religion upon its introduction into that Empire.

But the cardinal doctrine of the three countries is still Buddhism, but Buddhism interpreted and applied in their own way.

All alike accept Gautam Buddha as the supreme teacher of their religion. All agree that the being standing next to him is the Bodhisatv; and all agree in accepting the Bodhisatv as a being next only to Buddha; and following that school,

(1) In the Mongolian language *Dalai* means the "Ocean" Tibetan, Ragyamthso.

they take the number of Bodhisatvas to be unlimited; they assign them a place alongside of Maitreya in the Tushit heaven; but they equally recognize their earthly emanations or incarnations, and following the Mahayan method of selection, they have a way of their own in raising one to that degree. The successive stages in which a person may be promoted and finally attain that rank is characteristic of Tibetan Buddhism. In every monastery recruits are drawn from boys between the ages of seven and fifteen. These boy-pupils are called Bandi, Bante, or Bandya (1). The Bandi is apprenticed to a monk who makes him promise to keep the five commandments, namely:—

- (1) Thou shalt not kill.
- (2) Thou shalt not steal.
- (3) Thou shalt not commit adultery.
- (4) Thou shalt not lie.
- (5) Thou shalt not drink spirituous drinks.

After the age of fifteen he is promoted to be the junior monk called Gethsul (Getzul). His hair is then cut off and he dons the monkish robe. He has now to observe one hundred and twelve rules. He attends on the full monk whom he assists in all functions except consecration and blessing.

After his twentieth year, that is five years after his novitiate—which is the stage last described, he is consecrated a full monk and becomes eligible for the discharge of sacerdotal duties. He is then bound by two hundred and fifty-three rules of discipline.

Out of these monks, the *superior Gelongs* or Kanposts are selected for their greater knowledge or superior sanctity. It is then that they are ordained Lamas.

Out of the Lamas, the heads of monasteries are selected. But that fact alone does not give them any higher degree, so far as the forms of consecration are concerned. But the heads of important monasteries are elevated to a still higher rank, being consecrated Avtar Lama—a rank bestowed on the founders

(1) *Sk. Vandya* "fit to be saluted"—whom a the Bandi has to salute.
 a term more appropriate to monks to

of monasteries or one who has become still more conspicuous by his piety or learning. He then enters the Order of a Bodhisatv, but is the re-embodiment of an ordinary canonized saint, or a Bodhisatv of the lowest Order. Above him ranks the Khutuktu who is the re-incarnation of a higher Bodhisatv, really a deified saint and is usually one in charge of a still more important monastery. He even claims to be an incarnated Buddh.

But higher still than him and in fact the highest in the monastic Order, stand two Lamas—called the Dalai Lama ⁽¹⁾ with his Tibetan title of Ragyamthso Pinpoche or "ocean jewel" and Tashi (Teshu) Lama, who bears the Tibetan title of Panchen Ripoché ⁽²⁾ which means "the great Pandit Jewel" who ranks next only to the Dalai Lama, because while the latter is in charge of the metropolitan monastery at Lhasa, the other is in charge of an equally great monastery at the second metropolis of Tashi Lunpo (Krashi Lunpo)—a town about one hundred miles to the South West of Lhasa not very far from the Indian frontier. They are both held to be a continuous re-embodiment of Buddh or of his Bodhisatv; so that when they die, they re-appear, either after nine months or at most after the second or the third year, in children whose bodies they have occupied from conception.

The Dalai Lamas are held to be continuous re-incarnations of the Dhyani Bodhisatv Avalokiteshwar; while the Panchen Lamas similarly represent his father Dhyani Buddh Amitabha. These Buddhs being two out of the five Buddhs possible in the present age, of whom the earthly emanations are the above-named two.

Now since these Lamas become re-incarnated in children, it follows that mere children are sometimes elevated to the Grand Lamaship; in which case, the duties of their office are assigned to a Lama, who acts as his Regent—called Nomun-Khan or Nomin Khan (or No-min-han), while the boy Lama, even when grown up, if found unfit to govern, is supposed to lose himself in the sublime heights of meditation and receive divine

(1) In Mong. *Dalai* means the ocean.

(2) *Pan* i.e. *Pandit*, *chen*—great, *Ripo*—the Jewel.

homage. On a vacancy occurring, these two great offices are now in the gift of China; and before the establishment of a Republic, they were nominees of the Emperor. But formerly it was ordinarily left to one of the two Grand Lamas to divine in what family the soul of his deceased colleague would take its re-birth.

But this was the usual, though not the only way of ascertaining the re-incarnation of the Buddh-Lama. His appearance might be forecasted by the sooth-sayers, after consulting the sacred books, or the departing Lama might before his decease, reveal in what family he would re-appear and occasionally the Buddh might proclaim himself,—as if a child two or three years old, might by some spiritual influence be impelled to exclaim. "I am a living Buddh: I am the chief Lama of that monastery."

But these are the two privileged and high-placed Buddhs. But Tibet teems with living Buddhs since the numerous monasteries dotting Tibet vie with one another in making them. Little boys are brought up and declared to be living Buddhs. And it may be occasionally that these Buddhs are the illegitimate children of the Avtar Lamas in charge of a distant monastery.

No account of Buddhism in Tibet and the further East would be complete without a reference to its ceremonials, which arouse alike the curiosity and contempt of the foreigner. The foremost among them is the Tibetan prayer-wheel. Buddh countenanced no prayer, but prescribed an hour for meditation. But the Tibetans had prayed for their deliverance from the evil spirit before they adopted Buddhism; and they retained the prayer, but altered its form as soon as they came under the spell of the new religion. The prayer consists in the repetition of a set formula of six-syllabled sentence "*Om Manipadme Hum*,"⁽¹⁾ which simply means "Hail (thou) jewel in the Lotus."

(1) "*Om*."—Etymology obscure but probably the abbreviation of "A-I-M" being the initial letters of the Vedic Triad—*Agni* (Fire), *Indra* (thunder) and *Mitra* (the Sun). It was originally an invocation, but in later years obtained a sanctity by usage, though the gods to which it referred had ceased to have their day. It is now used for "Hail" and to possess magic

potency when repeated at the commencement of every prayer, rite or religious ceremony. *Mani*—jewel, *Padm*—lotus, "*Hum*" a particle (originally an imitative sound) expressing remembrance or recollection to mark a pause or signify that the spell is done or has taken effect. The prayer then means. "Om the jewel in the Lotus! *Hum*."

It is a prayer addressed to Avalokiteshwar, the patron Bodhisattv of Tibet, and composed by him as *Padm-pani*, foreshadowing his future manifestation as the patron-saint of Tibet. It is the "Mani" or Jewel prayer, which cannot be repeated too often and the efficacy of which lies in its repetition. Consequently mechanical means have been devised to this end. The prayer is written or printed on paper-rolls and inscribed in cylinders which are turned by hand, the revolutions having the effect of multiplying the prayer-force passed on to the credit of the person who revolves the wheel or pays for it. These prayer-mills are installed everywhere. Other forms of the formula sometimes employed are "Om ! Vajrapani Hum," "Hail Vajrapani" ⁽¹⁾ or only—"Om Ha Hum" or mere monosyllabics such as "Ram" "Phat" "Hrim," "Rim," "Rim" and "Hris" which are all, it is stated, variations of the Hindu god Ramchandra, whom the Hindus similarly pray by ejaculating "Ram, Ram" counting it on a rosary. The Tibetans call these abbreviated prayers "Dharni."

In order to accumulate merit, the devout have taken to erecting votive offerings in the shape of prayer-walls on the road-side in which the prayers are engraved on slabs of stones let in, and varied by images of saints which, in order to acquire merit, the passers-by must pass on the left and follow the letters of the inscriptions. Prayer-flags with the prayers inscribed thereon are also hoisted on poles and they waft the prayers on the wind which waves them. These flags are similarly adorned with the pictures of sacred objects, such as the "flying horse," the Norbu gem ⁽²⁾ and the Phurbu which serve also to ward off evil spirits and neutralize the diseases inflicted by them. The flags dot all Tibetan villages and extend down to Darjeeling where the Bhutanese villagers hold them as charms or talismans against the malignant influences of evil spirits. The Buddhists in these parts also use the same rosaries as the Hindus, with one hundred and eight beads to count their prayers; only while the rosaries of the Hindus are made of beads made of the Sacred Basel or the Rudhraksh

(1) The Thunder-bolt handed Bodhisattv.

(2) A gem of the seven treasures.

berries, those of the Tibetans might be made of anything, including the bones of a Lama when they are specially prized. Such rosaries are used even in China and Japan, only they are arranged in double strings with larger beads and relics attached as central pendants.

But with all this the Buddhist does not forget his Master's exhortation to his Sangh to get together and meditate. Accordingly, the Tibetans meet thrice a day, morning, noon and evening, in the public squares and kneel down and chant their prayers.

Buddhism in China.—Turning next to China, it has been stated that the Buddhist hierarchy of China is not graded. We have first the Ho-Shang or the indigenous Chinese monks, and secondly the Lamas who are supported by the State and whose chief—the Head Lama, is in charge of the metropolitan monastery.

The Teaching of Confucius.—Before the conversion of China to Buddhism, its principal religions were Taoism and Confucianism ⁽¹⁾. But the systems of the latter two teachers, who were contemporaries, were more ethical than religious, so that when Buddhism penetrated the land, it became easily assimilated with the existing system and then conjointly in fusion, or separately in unison, have dominated its religious life. In order to understand the influence of Buddhism and the place it took and has since occupied in the one time "Celestial Empire", we have to examine its earlier history. As previously stated, Buddhism did not get into China till the first century before the Christian era. Confucius (550-478 B.C.) was born about 550-B.C. and was, therefore, a contemporary of Gautam Buddh. At his birth, China, though nominally under the sway of the decadent Chow dynasty, which had ruled over it for a thousand years (1,122-256 B.C.), was really divided into several states,—large and small, numbering about one hundred and fifty, who paid only nominal allegiance to the king, and were mostly occupied in waging wars upon one another. As Confucius had

⁽¹⁾ Confucius is merely the Latinized form or "*Master Kung*", (*Kung* was the clan of Kung Futsé—meaning "the philosopher" name of Confucius).

himself written in the Annals of Lu, his native State: "In those days there was nothing in China, and every prince did what was right in his own eyes." Confucius appeared at this crisis in the nation's history. "The world had fallen into decay, and the right principles had disappeared. Perverse courses and oppressive deeds were waxing rife. Ministers murdered their rulers, and sons, their fathers. Confucius was frightened by what he saw and he undertook the work of reformation." Confucius came of a royal line, but his father who was over seventy when he was born, died when he was only three years old, and young Confucius had to face poverty and want. But he was from early age given to religious life and when he was only five or six, people took notice of his fondness for playing with his companions at setting out sacrifices, and at postures of ceremony. He married at nineteen and then took service as a store-keeper, because of his poverty. When twenty two he started a school in which two scions of a wealthy family of his Native-town—Lu, joined as pupils. With the help of the Marquis of the state, Confucius and his two pupils proceeded to the capital of the kingdom where he made the acquaintance of Lao-tsze, the founder of Taoism who greatly impressed him, though he himself did not impress the transcendental dreamer. Subsequently in his 52nd year Confucius was appointed a Magistrate an office in which he discharged his duties with such ability that promotions came to him in succession.

But disgusted with the profligacy of his master, he left him in his 56th year and took to a wandering life in the course of which he met recluses who advised him to join them which he refused to do, adding: "It is impossible to withdraw from the world, and associate with birds and beasts that have no affinity with us. With whom should I associate but with suffering men? The disorder that prevails requires my efforts. If right principle ruled through the kingdom, there would be no necessity for me to change its state." But the ruler of the State would not re-employ him—and bowed by disappointment, he took to his bed and after seven days died. He owes his fame not to his literary writings which are ephemeral or philosophic

speculations which are enigmatic, but to the combined adulation and labours of his disciples, who collected his sayings and followed his teachings and moral precepts on the formation of individual character and the manner in which one's obligations to the society should be discharged.

His golden rule which he had deduced from the study of man's mental constitution was: "Don't do to others what you don't like others to do to you." He popularized an old apothegm ascribed to an ancient king and hero, who flourished 1,200 years before he was born and who had said: "Man is born good, because he is born with a moral sense, it is the duty of the sovereign to use it to ensure tranquillity in his state." Confucius distinguished two main elements in this fund of nature's goodness: (1) charity of heart, resulting in an out-flow of love towards our fellow-men, and (2) the principle of righteousness or conscience which should serve to regulate our conduct. To him Education meant the assiduous cultivation of these two natural instincts. As to the duty of the sovereign, he declared that if the ruler is personally upright, his subjects will do their duty unbidden; if he is not upright, they will not obey, whatever his bidding. In the multiplication of laws and restrictions Confucius had little faith. "People despotically governed and kept in order by punishments may avoid infraction of the law, but they will lose their moral sense. People virtually governed and kept in order by the inner law of self-control, will retain their moral sense, and moreover, become good."

In this way Confucius imparted his instruction. He drew his inspiration from the treasures of old, but he threw upon them a flood of new light gained by his varied knowledge and versatile experience.

He opined and passed current through his pupils his ethical views in the form of short and pithy epigrams. His religious views were similarly expressed. In his earlier writings he frequently referred to the "Supreme Beings," but in his later life his references were to an impersonal force and he advised men

not to occupy themselves with anything but themselves. But in China religion was then, as it is indeed now, under State control and everybody had to offer services to the spirits of the departed, which Confucius did, but when questioned what constituted wisdom—he added “To give one’s self earnestly to the duties due to men, and while respecting spiritual beings, to keep aloof from them—that may be called wisdom.” When asked whether he did not believe in the service of the departed ancestors, he said—“While you cannot serve men, how can you serve spirits.” “Ceremonies forsooth,” he once exclaimed, “can ceremonies be reduced to a mere matter of silken robes and jaded ornaments?” “Music forsooth! Can music be reduced to a mere matter of bells and drums?” In this he was insisting on sincerity as more essential to the religion than the mere observance of its forms.

His views on future life were equally ambiguous. While you do not know life, what can you know about death? The fact is Confucius was truly sceptical of a future life, and in this he voiced the opinions of a generation of thinkers of his country who had preceded him. His view on morality was purely utilitarian. Honesty was to him the best policy; because it was best for the man who was honest, and if he does not receive the reward, it will fall to his descendants. He had faith in man and to him man and his society were his sole concern. He did not care to gaze beyond the grave and if, perchance, he attempted it, he saw nothing. The following sayings of his, will shew the practical wisdom which he imparted to his disciples. Contrasting the higher and the lower type of man, he said: “The nobler sort of man is calm and serene; the inferior man is constantly agitated and worried. The nobler sort of man is proficient in the knowledge of his duty; the inferior man is proficient only in money-making. The nobler sort of man is accommodating, but not obsequious; the inferior man is obsequious, but not accommodating. The nobler sort of man is dignified, but not proud; the inferior man is proud, but not dignified.”

Confucius never founded any religious system. He was a teacher of morals,—not even a teacher of religion, though at

one period of his life, he permitted himself to believe in the revelation of his teachings. But in later life he grew wiser ; and confined himself to the imparting of practical wisdom in terse and pithy aphorisms. The essence of his teachings sprang from the eternal principles of human nature. Filial piety, conscientiousness and charity, forbearance towards others and a saving sense of moderation in all things—these are virtues which make no religion, though they are the eternal principles of all religions. And in this sense Confucius was a religious teacher, but in no other.

Confucian precepts were addressed to the learned, and remained the heritage of the learned. The populace were never moved by his teachings.

Taoism.—The second religion which influenced the religious life of China before its conversion to Buddhism, the religion called Taoism, is said to have been founded by Lao-tsze (609-4 B.C.). "Tao" means "The way" and Taoism points the way to virtuous life. Lao-tsze—(his surname was Li and his name Wih) was born in or about 604 B.C. in a hamlet. He was appointed a historiographer at the Court of Chan in charge of the royal library which gave him a chance to make himself acquainted with the history and philosophy of his country. He resided at the capital of Chan ; but after a long time, seeing the decay of the dynasty, he composed the celebrated treatise called *Tao Teh King* and then disappeared from the city. The treatise, which embodies his views, captured the imagination of the people ; and its principles, which were purely ethical, gave rise to the cult of Taoism which became the religion of China. The main theme of Lao-tsze's teaching on the existence of God was agnostio. "Tao" he wrote "is like the emptiness of a vessel and the use of it, we may say, must be free from all self-sufficiency. How deep and mysterious it is, as if it were, the author of all things. We should make our sharpness blunt, and unravel the complications of things ; we should hamper our brightness, and assimilate ourselves to the obscurity caused by dust. How still and clear ■ Tao, a phantasm with the semblance of per-

manence ! I do not know whose son it is. It might appear to have been before God."

In the last sentence of his treatise he writes. " It is the Tao—the way—of Heaven to benefit and not injure ; it is the Tao—the way—to do and not strive." The Heaven he speaks of, he explains to be merely one's notion of it. He says, " We must not forget that this heaven is inferior and subsequent to the mysterious Tao, and was in fact produced by it." Concerning man, the Tao teaches the simplicity of spontaneity of action, without motive, free from all selfish purpose, resting in nothing but its own accomplishment. This is found in the phenomena of the natural world.

" All things," he says, " spring up without a word spoken, and grow without a claim for their production. They go through their processes without any display of pride in them, and the results are realized without any assumption of ownership. It is owing to the absence of such assumption that the results and their processes do not disappear."

To him, a government conducted on the same principle would be an ideal government. " A government conducted by sages would free the hearts of the people from inordinate desires, fill their bellies, keep their ambitions feeble and strengthen their bones. They would constantly keep the people without knowledge and free from desires ; and where there were those who had knowledge, they would have them so that they would not dare to put it in practice." The same rules equally apply to individual action. He must act " as a little child," spontaneously and " without striving or crying" he says that he cannot say enough on the practice of humility and " not presuming to take precedence in the world:" added to which, he prized gentle compassion and economy. " It is the way of the Tao not to act from any personal motive, to conduct affairs without feeling the trouble of them, to taste without being aware of the flavour, to account the great, to recompense injury with the kindness ". This last—the return of good for evil struck a higher chord in social ethics and was the subject of discussion between him and Confucius. He condemns the practice of war,

would probably abolish capital punishment, but otherwise he had no sympathy with the progress of society or with the culture and arts of life. On the other hand, he would take society back to its primeval simplicity. "In a small state with a few inhabitants, I would so order it that the people, though supplied with all kinds of implements, would not care to use them; I would give them cause to look on death as the most grievous thing, while yet they would not go away to a distance to escape from it. Though they had boats and carriages, they should have no occasion to ride in them. Though they had buff-coats and sharp weapons they should not don or use them. I would make them return to the use of knotted cords (instead of written characters). They should think their coarse food sweet, their plain clothing beautiful, their poor houses, places of rest, and their common simple ways, sources of enjoyment. There should be a neighbouring state within sight, and the sound of the fowls and dogs should be heard from it to us without interruption, but I would make the people to old age, even to death, have no intercourse with it." Much of what the Tao contains is in the same strain. Its main purpose is the insistence on simplicity and spontaneity.

Taoism was never intended to be a religion. It never became one, till long after the introduction of Buddhism, and then it deteriorated into a polytheism comprising "celestial gods", "great gods" and "divine rulers" to which was added the wildest superstition, magic, alchemy, geomancy and spiritualism. That this was its tendency appears from the course it took in the third century B.C. when Taoism had already become associated with a search for the family islands of the eastern sea, where the herb of immortality might be gathered.

It is thus clear that while China had both Confucianism and Taoism, neither has as yet been really embodied in any religious institution,—a form which they took only with the establishment of Buddhism.

The question as to what extent Buddhism submitted to the tenets and usages of the indigenous institutions, is a question of detail which cannot be entered into here. But one thing is

certain. So far as religion is concerned, Buddhism found in China virgin soil for the growth of its own doctrines. The religious doctrines of the two contemporaries of Buddha did not differ materially from his own; and so far as they did, they became easily dovetailed into the newer system. The Chinese had as yet evolved no theory of spiritual life and life's final destiny. Buddhism supplied this gap and up to the present, it remains the only system to which the Chinese nation acknowledge their adherence. The Chinese Buddhism has been materially influenced by the Tibetan, where tenets have been amplified in a voluminous literature and its practice thrown into a form of complexity, which through the outer-growth of the Mahayan school, have acquired an individuality which is nothing else if it is not sectarian.

But the cardinal teachings of Buddha are still the main pivot of both the Tibetan and Chinese systems, though it is to a large extent coloured by the innate superstition of the people.

With the establishment of Buddhism in China, a stream of pilgrims began to flow towards India of whom only two have left a record of their travels. In 290 A.D. Chu Si-hing visited Khotan; a few years later another pilgrim named Fa-Ling visited India, while judging from the Chinese inscriptions discovered at Buddha Gaya on stone-pillars of the names of benefactors, several parties of pilgrims appear to have visited that place from time to time, though their real names cannot be now discovered; since in accordance with an ancient practice, they used to discard them at the time of leaving their homes and assume the title of Shakyaputra. Thus Kung who visited India in 400 A.D. changed his name to Fa-hian to which he added the title of Shih or the Shakyaputra. He has left a record of his travels. ⁽¹⁾ Another pilgrim Sung Yun visited India in 515 A.D. and the record of his travels is also extant. ⁽²⁾

The third pilgrim of whom we have a written record is Hiuen Tsiang, whose memoirs are both voluminous and extensive.⁽³⁾

(1) *Buddhist Records, Introduction*
I-XXXIII-LXXXIII-CVIII

(2) *Ib.*, LXXXIV—the memoirs of

both these pilgrims are short and occupy only a few pages.

(3) *Western Records* Vols. I and II.

They record his impressions of the country visited by him and while the previous pilgrims spent only a short time in India, Hiuen Tsiang's travels through the Holy land occupied him about sixteen years (629-645 A.D.), in the course of which he had collected a quantity of relics and a large number of books which were translated into Chinese, of which seventy-five are included in the collection of the Chinese Tripitak.

Buddhism in Japan.—Turning next to Japan, another Buddhist country, the religion, which Buddhism partially displaced and with which it became partially assimilated, was Shintoism. But Shintoism was never a religion and it contained no moral code. Shinto means literally "the way of the gods",—the gods being no others than deified heroes of whom the visible embodiment on earth is the *Mikado*, represented to be the direct descendant and actual representative of the sun-goddess, whose commands are, therefore, in the nature of divine ordinance, which it is the duty of the Japanese to implicitly and reverentially obey. The system admitted of the exaltation of renowned warriors and of persons distinguished in other fields as demi-gods. The introduction of Buddhism from Korea occurred in the year 552 A.D. and by the beginning of the ninth century, it became amalgamated with Shintoism, whose gods and demi-gods were then taken to be nothing more than transmigrations of the Buddhist Bodhisatvas. Thus the fusion of the two religions and their reconciliation is ascribed to the priest Kukai (now known as Koho Daishi) who propounded that doctrine in his system called the *Riobu Shinto*. Local sentiment being thus gratified, the expansion of Buddhism encountered no further obstacle; and it had long been the State religion of Japan which was again formally declared by the famous rescript of the 1st January 1874. All State-grants to the Shinto temples and shrines were then withdrawn, though a few of them still linger, being maintained by private charity.

The religious organization of Japan is based on the *Chinese* model. There is no supreme spiritual authority at the head of the Buddhist Church, each monastery ■ in independent charge of its own elected or selected Head.

Expediency and policy alike have popularized similar organizations in the southern countries which are moreover supported there by the orthodox canon to which they hold themselves as subject.

Burma.—The southern Buddhistic countries, such as Siam, Burma and Ceylon being inheritors of the Hinyan system, still possess a purer form of Buddhism, though in those countries too, the form of religion prevalent before the introduction of Buddhism was the demon and the Nag-worship. The Nagas were a class of serpent-demons with human faces and the lower extremities of a serpent, who lived in Patal or the nether regions and these became easily assimilated to the Buddhistic cosmogony, by themselves becoming the worshippers of Buddh. So, one of them Mucilind is said to have sheltered Buddh when he was overtaken by a storm. In all the three countries, the doctrines of the Hinyan school are accepted. There are monks, but with no recognized hierarchy, though there is a presiding Head in charge of each monastery; but there is no supreme authority like the Dalai Lama in Tibet or the Archbishop of the Christian system. The monks in Ceylon employ their time in chanting the *Tripitaks* with its commentary the *Arthkatha* and meet four times a month to make confessions, employing their spare time in fasting, praying and in teaching the laity. They have boy-pupils, novices and full monks and their admission ceremonies are those prescribed in the *Mahavagga*. In Burma the images of Buddh are installed in their temples, called the Pagodas; but they are revered, not worshipped.

When Ashoke sent his missionary mission to Burma, the only religion it had—was that known as Shamanism which, as elsewhere, comprised the worship of evil spirits called *nats* who had a kingdom of their own to torment mankind. They and their King Thakia Min had accordingly to be propitiated by votive offerings made through the priests who were their intermediaries. These *nats* sometimes possessed women at festivals held in their honour. When Buddhism became established, the *nats* receded into the back-ground, but did not

wholly disappear and their King was assigned a place akin to that of the God Indra in the Hindu pantheon. Buddhism had to be content with a similar reception elsewhere. Indeed, it has been well observed, "An advanced religion, when first given to a people, never finds in their minds a clean slate to write upon. The heritage of many generations is not completely blotted out even in its leaders by an intellectual assent to new ideas, and the masses of the people only follow far behind their leaders, combining a little and little more of the new religion with the old.

"Thus no advanced religion is quite the same as it is expounded by its teachers, and as it is regarded by the masses of their followers; and the existence of many non-Buddhist beliefs and practices amongst the Burmese Buddhists would not be a denial of their claim to be Buddhists." (1) As such, the Burman while accepting the new light, did not wholly abandon the old—the malevolent influence of which he felt all the greater need for propitiating, because it insured his reception of the new creed without disturbance from the forces of evil. The *nats* became thus relegated to the back-wood of wilder Burma and, in other places, to just that consideration which they could exact during the prevalence of a pestilence—smallpox or cholera. Elsewhere the bulk of the people support the numerous monasteries with their attached schools and Pagodas (2) which keep Buddhism continuously before the eyes of the people.

The monks preach to the people and the people listen to them, and as they grow older they turn to meditation and begin to seek the only way to Nirvan. The Buddhism of Burma is that of the Hinyan school, materially modified by the Mahayan practice and extends to the adjoining independent kingdom of Siam where the monasteries, called *wats* (3) are

(1) S. G. Grantham's *Burma census Report Ch. IV extracted in (1921) India census Vol. I. Pt. I. App. V. P. XVI.*

(2) "Buddhist Temples in Burma." corrupted form Pali *Ḍagaba* (Sk. *Dhātu*—*gurb* i. e. "Receptacle of the sacred

elements; or relics of the body). There are the largest pagodas in Burma at Pegu (333 ft. high) Rangoon (the Shwe Dagon pagoda) 328 ft and at Arakan which is the oldest.

(3) Sk. *Wat*.—an enclosure, court.

built on the banks of rivers or canals. They contain one or more Vihans⁽¹⁾ or places for the images of Buddha and his disciples.

As in Burma, every male considers it his duty to spend some time, at least a couple of months, in a monastery,—which he generally does at the age of twenty. As in Burma and Ceylon, the food collected by begging is no longer eaten, and as there, the monks act as teachers; but here they also act as doctors, though their cure is confined to charms and faith-healing rather than the administration of medicines. Like the *nats* of Burma, Siam has also its spirit population of *Phis* who include Indian deities and *Prets*,⁽²⁾ though the majority comprise ghosts and spirits to whom shrines are dedicated.

Java.—Java and the Malay Archipelago had been colonized by Indians before they came under the influence of Buddhism. The name Java is itself said to be a Sanskrit word, derived from *Yava* which means “barley”. It is mentioned in the *Ramayan*.⁽³⁾ In 418 A.D. the Buddhist pilgrim returned to China *via* Java which he described as in the hands of the heretics and the Brahmans, “but the law of Buddha hardly deserves mentioning.”⁽⁴⁾ The Indian Kings ruled Java at the dawn of the Christian era and travellers at the present day are struck by the relics of Hindu civilization and culture which have left their vestiges on the names, architecture and social institutions of the country. Java was converted to the Mahayan sect of Buddhism by the disciples of Vasubandhu (360 A.D.) in the fifth century.⁽⁵⁾

Ceylon.—The extension of Buddhism to the island of Ceylon is generally ascribed to Mahendra’s mission, despatched by Ashoke; but the Sinhalese tradition ascribes the conversion of the island to the expedition of Vijay, who with seven hundred followers settled in the island about the time of Buddha’s death. There is, of course, a great deal of mythical exaggeration about the tradition. For instance, in order to

(1) Corr. from Vihar.

(2) *Pret* —spirit, ghost.

(3) IV-40-30

(4) Ch. XI; Legge p. 113;

(5) *Faravath* Ch. 39.

explain why Ceylon is called Sinhal, Vijay is described as the grand-son of an Indian princess who lived with a lion. The language of the island in its earliest known form was a dialect of Pali and still resembles the Marathi Prakrit of western India.

The three great repositories of the Sinhalese tradition are the *Dipvans*, (362-430 A.D.) the *Mahavans* and Buddh ghosh's *Samant-Pasādika*—All three are historical memoirs ; of which *Dipvans* is the earliest and *Mahavans* is an enlarged edition in which the materials of the *Dipvans* were re-arranged and ecclesiastical and popular legends added. It was continued by later writers and the narrative brought down to 1780 A.D. Buddh ghosh wrote a commentary on the *Mahavans* about 100-150 A.D. All the three ascribe the conversion of Ceylon to the initiative of Moggaliputta who presided at the first council at Pataliputra. But the Ashoke edicts mention the despatch of a mission by him. This mission was led by Mahendra, his son or brother—probably a near relation. He first preached to and converted King Davanampiya Tissa (died 207 B.C.) who took up the cause of Buddhism in Ceylon as earnestly as Ashoke was doing in India. He despatched two missions to collect relics and the second mission was despatched to bring a branch of the Bo tree which is said to have been planted in the Meghvan garden with much ceremony and which still exists and is visited by pilgrims from Burma and Siam. A large monastery grew up in its vicinity and it became the citadel of Sinhalese Buddhism. But it soon found a formidable rival in another monastery erected at Abhyagiri and conflicts between the two in later years became notorious.

A few years after the death of Tissa, the kingdom passed (in 177 B.C.) to the Tamil Kings from India who were not Buddhists. They, however, supported the Church, but in course of time a descendant of Tissa—named Dutthagamani—wrested his kingdom from the hands of the Tamils and made Buddhism once more his State-religion and endowed the island with some of its most magnificent monasteries.

Ceylon prides itself on its possession of some invaluable relics of Buddha including his tooth two inches long, which is treasured in a special temple, known as the Dalad Maligawa (or the sacred eye-tooth) at Kandy. It is worshipped even by the Hindus of Ceylon. Its genuineness is guaranteed by its history ⁽¹⁾ and the tradition that Buddha was twenty cubits ⁽²⁾ high. But it is not the only relic—his dress, his begging-bowl and other relics are equally prized and as devoutly worshipped alongside of the idols of Vishnu and other gods who are curiously installed in the same temple, though they are stated to be only venerated and not worshipped.

Position of Women.—The position of women in Buddhism marks a revolution in the social ethics of a people who had consigned them to perpetual dependence: "Their fathers protect them in childhood, their husbands protect them in youth, their sons protect them in age: a woman is never fit for independence." ⁽³⁾ Such is the behest of Manu—which follows usage. It is true, women had in spite of their dependence, occupied positions of responsibility in the Vedic age, but it was not because of, but in spite of, their womanhood. The Hindu religion gave them protection and classed them with children and imbeciles for that purpose. Buddha gave them a position of equality with men. They were admitted to his order and were raised to monk-hood and several of them rose to be accredited teachers of the law. Buddha made no distinction between women, high or low, virtuous or degraded. And some of his most devout and devoted followers belonged to that sex. They ministered to the wants of the sick Bhikkhus and there is an instance on record when one of them—Suppiya—a lay devotee cut a piece of her own thigh to provide a sick Bhikkhu with broth which he had asked for and she had promised. ⁽⁴⁾ Another woman disciple of his—Vishakha, described as "learned, expert and wise," had made an endowment for the maintenance of the Bhikkhus and Buddha thanked her in these words: "Whatsoever woman,

(1) *Dathavamsa* (History of the tooth) (310 A.D.)

(2) *Cubit*—18 inches.

(3) *Manu* IX—3; (*Jones Tr.*) 194; to the same effect *Ib* V. 148 p. 113.

(4) *M. V.* VI. 22; 17 S.E.E. 78-84.

upright in life, a disciple of the Happy One gives, glad at heart and overcoming avarice, both food and drink—a gift heavenly, destructive of sorrow, productive of bliss—a heavenly life does she attain, entering upon the path that is free from corruption and impurity.”⁽¹⁾ Of women generally he declared: “There is no meanness in women; and women cannot be owned nor⁽²⁾ treated as chattels.”

On one occasion the Master had sent Anand to a village. He passed by a well where he saw Prakriti, a girl of the Matang caste, whom he asked for a drink. Prakriti told him that she was of low caste, and could not give him the drink, to which Anand replied: “I ask not for caste, but for water,” which the Matang girl gave him. Anand thanked her and then resumed his journey; but the girl followed him at a distance. Having heard that he was Gautam’s disciple, she went up to him and said: “O Lord! help me, and let me live in the place where Anand, thy disciple, dwells, for I love him.” The Blessed One, understood the emotions of her heart, and spoke to her: “Prakriti, thy heart is full of love, but you do not understand your own sentiments. It is not Anand whom you love, but his kindness. Receive then the kindness you have seen him practise unto you, and in the humility of your station practise it unto others. Verily, there is great merit in the generosity of a King when he is kind to a slave; but there is a greater merit in the slave when ignoring the wrongs which he suffers, he cherishes kindness and good-will to all mankind. He will cease to hate his oppressors and even when powerless to resist their usurpation, will with compassion pity their arrogance and supercilious demeanour.”

“Blessed are thou Prakriti, for thou art a Matang, you will be a model for noble men and noble women. You are of low caste, but Brahmans will learn a lesson from you. Swerve not from the path of justice and righteousness and you will outshine the royal glory of queens on the throne.”

He had admitted his own step-mother and his wife to the Order. He is, of course, careful to preserve the morals of his monks by keeping them separate from the nuns, and it is in this connection that some passages occur in his writings, exhorting his disciples to shun their gaze, not to speak to them, and keep aloof from them. "Lust be clouds a man's heart, when it is confused with woman's beauty, and the mind is dazed. Better far with red-hot irons bore out both your eyes, than encourage in yourself sensual thoughts, or look upon a woman's form with lustful desires. Better fall into the fierce tiger's mouth, or under the sharp knife of the executioner, than dwell with a woman and excite in yourself lustful thoughts."

All accounts agree that Buddha was averse to throwing open his Order to women and that the credit of receiving that admission must go to Anand; for it was due to his entreaties to admit Prajapatni Gautami, step-and-the-foster-mother of Buddha to the order, that Buddha reluctantly yielded to admit women to a subordinate Order on the following eight conditions: (1) they must thoroughly understand their duties; (2) they must and ought every half-month beg a Bhikkha; (3) they shall not pass the *Vassa* season in a place where there are no Bhikkhus; (4) they must live sufficiently separated from them so as not to see and hear or fear their proximity; (5) they must by words or by reviving recollections not damage the morals of a Bhikkhu; (6) they shall not be wrathful, abusive, or do anything sinful; (7) they shall confess their sins to a Bhikkhu every fortnight; (8) they, though ordained to live since a hundred years, shall always revere and rise, before a Bhikkhu even if he be recently ordained, bow to him and honour him. (1) Gautami accepted these conditions and she and other women including Buddha's own wife, Yashodhara, were admitted to the Order.

It has been said that Buddha was a born misogynist and was opposed to the admission of women into his Order, and when at last he yielded to the solicitations of Anand and his

(1) *Tibetan Legends*, 61-62.

other disciples, he plainly told them that their admission had shortened the longevity of his Dharma from 1,000 to 500 years and that while he admitted women to be nuns, he placed them under the direction of the monks, because he dared not trust them with greater autonomy. That all these conclusions are borne out by several of his recorded references admit of no doubt; but in this respect a certain measure of scepticism may not be wholly unjustifiable; the more so, if we cannot readily reconcile his reported utterances with his acts. That women were to him an object of suspicion is proved by the fact that he had placed their Order in subordination to men.

But if Buddha were the misogynist he is held to be, one thing is clear that he would never have yielded to the pressure of his disciples in permitting their ordinance; on the other hand, the fact that from the very inception of his career as the Enlightened Teacher, he welcomed them, both high and low, at least as lay followers to his Order, shows that his hesitation, if any, could not have been influenced by his sexual aversion, but was more likely the outcome of practical expediency. Women in his time were even less educated than they are now. He had planned for his disciples a life of austere celibacy, and he knew too well the lure of women.

But in taking the courageous course he did, in eliminating the distinction of sex from his Order, he wrought an innovation, which must have been as welcome to the women as it was the logical deduction of his doctrine which could not deny to one sex the solace of religion, nor limit its beatitude only to men. But while it is so, there is abundant circumstantial evidence to show that neither Buddha nor his disciples were at first willing to receive women into their Order; and when Buddha yielded, it was not because of his logic but because of Anand's persuasion. Nor was Anand a logical doctrinaire or a sentimental feminist. In persuading the master to obliterate the consideration of sex, he was only anxious for the admission of his own relations.

But, of course, it would have been too invidious to have admitted a few relations and barred the door against the rest. The relaxation had, therefore, to be more general. But it did not please the patriarchs like Kashyap who had harboured a deep grudge against Anand, because of his advocacy. And when the Master died and the first council was convened, Kashyap took exception to Anand's admission thereto; and when Anand pleaded for forgiveness, Kashyap gave vent to his long pent-up feelings on the subject: "How comes it," he asked, "that when the Blessed One said that women were as dangerous as snakes and that it would be wrong to admit them into the Order, thou didst ask that they might be allowed to enter it?" "Bear with me a while, Kashyap" replied Anand, "I thought of all that Maha Prajapati Gautami had endured and how it was she who had nursed the Blessed One, when his mother died. I only asked that women who are my relatives and friends might enter the Order. 'Twas surely no wonder! no subject of shame"⁽¹⁾! But in spite of this apology the fact remains that Buddhism was directly responsible for the uplift of womanhood in the East.

As Mr. W. S. Lilly, the well-known Catholic author wrote, "Buddhism has raised woman to an elevation never before attained by her in the Oriental world."⁽²⁾ And Sir James Scott writing of the Burmanwoman, points out that "there is no difference between man and woman, but that which has been established by superiority of virtue; and hence it is that the state of woman amongst Buddhists is so very much higher than it is amongst the Oriental people who do not hold the faith. The Burmese woman enjoys many rights which her European sister is now clamouring for"⁽³⁾.

Whatever mystery may envelop the teachings of Buddh, no mystery shrouds their far-reaching effects upon

(1) *Tibetan Legends*, 152.

(2) *Many Mansions*: 209.

(3) *The Burman: His Life and Notions*.

133. But this was written before the recent legislation which has equalized the status of women in England.

the civilization, art, and culture of ancient India. Civilization has been defined as the art of living together. As such, Buddhism was the first to break down the impenetrable barriers which had divided man from man. His system admitted of no caste and no degree—no social disability and no predestined adhesion to the self-centred interest. His larger view of humanity and its social obligations had widened the outlook of man, and it may be doubted if the full effect of his ethics has yet been realized. The historian who has recorded the world-wide activity of Ashoke records a fact, but does not go deeper into the main-spring of his actions.

CHAPTER XII

THE DOCTRINE OF BUDDHISM.

God or No-God.

Buddhism is not a science, nor philosophy ; nor indeed was it taught as a religion. It was originally conceived and imparted to, as an ethical principle for the purification of the mind, though it has since developed into a religion and a philosophy. Even as an exegesis of ethics it was, as given, neither logical in its method nor scientific in its arrangement ; since the Master had never to expound his system as ■ in ■ class-room, nor did he intend that it should be collected into a treatise, or indeed, be at all available for a systematic study. His teachings suffer on that account. They are all disjointed, and in places contradictory ; nor have all the subjects to which his teachings extend received proportionate, and, in some, at all an adequate treatment. His glossators have suffered from this disproportionate handling of the subjects. And on that account Buddhism has been much misunderstood even by those who approach it with sympathy.

In order to understand Buddhism aright, we have to re-arrange its subjects and collect in one place all the scattered references to them in the scriptures. These, again, follow a fortuitous course. The European scholar who reads Buddhism finds it a jumble of confused ideas which he sets down with scorn ; but even those who have made it a subject of their special study have at times to turn away from it with a feeling of disgust ; witness, for example, M. Saint Hilaire's comments on Buddhism. " But it is time to close these lengthy considerations on Buddhism. We will now summarize these criticisms by applying them to some fundamental theories.

" Transmigration, which is the starting point of all his doctrine, is but an indefensible hypothesis, which Buddh

doubtless did not invent, but which he accepted, and from which he drew the most deplorable conclusions.

"His ethics are incomplete and fruitless, inasmuch as they repose on a thoroughly false idea of the nature of man, and of the life he leads here below.

"Nirvan, or annihilation is a monstrous conception, repugnant to all the instincts of human nature, revolting to reason, and implying atheism.

"Reduced to these terms, Buddhism ought to inspire more pity than contempt; yet it has reigned for many centuries, and it still reigns over a multitude of races, offering to their credulity the melancholy doctrines we have just viewed, as sole nourishment of their faith, which is all the more ardent, the more absurd it is. By the idea of transmigration, it plunges them into a fantastic world which prevents their understanding the real conditions of the one they live in. Moreover, his ethics, which were unable to save men, were even less fitted to constitute any equitable or intelligent societies. His doctrine of Nirvan degraded man lower than the brutes, which have at least this advantage over him, that they do not defy annihilation, which they do not dream of. In one word, he has totally failed to recognise either nature, duty, or personal dignity. He aimed at delivering humanity, but only destroyed it; he wished to enlighten it, and has cast it into the deepest gloom. His intentions may have been noble, but his general action, with some few exceptions, has been fatal; and it may be justly doubted, if the nations he has lost will ever find, or even accept, any remedy for the evil he has done them, and will continue to do for many a day." (1)

Other scholars have used similar, and scarcely any more guarded language—not that such language is wholly unwarranted by the language which Buddha is reported to have used in his discursive discourses to his disciples. But is it right to lay undue emphasis upon one discourse, overlooking the trend of others bearing on the same subject? The fact

(1) St. Hilaire "*The Buddha and his Religion*" 174, 175.

■ that Buddhism has suffered from its discursive teachings and Buddha himself—a religious teacher and neither a logician nor a synthetic philosopher—cannot be acquitted of all blame in giving occasion for the misunderstanding arising from his laying undue emphasis upon the point he was immediately concerned with, overlooking its effect upon other points closely associated with the subject of his immediate teaching.

In a vast conglomerate system, in which metaphysical problems are inextricably bound up with those of sociological ethics, a certain amount of discrepancy is natural, and indeed, inevitable. No teaching of Christianity, indeed, of any other religion can escape that fate. But if we wish to approach the question with a close analytical mind and eliminate from our discussion all that is otiose and even contradictory, being the outcome of the exigency of the moment, inserted by the devout zeal of the disciples, we shall find sufficient materials in the scattered scriptures to construct a system which was the pith and marrow of the Buddhist doctrine and which alone the great teacher intended to treat as the cardinal lessons of his doctrine.

A critical examination of Buddhism must then proceed upon analysis of the scriptures taken as a whole. It must take note of what were the fundamentals of his doctrine and how far they are modified or shaken by the casual references which militate with them. It is not re-construction of the system, nor, indeed, is it garbling. It is the presentment of a case with all its strength and all its drawbacks thrown into an impartial perspective. But to attain that end, there must be no over-touching of the light and shade. There must be, indeed, no touching at all. All that is needed is the re-arrangement of the focus and its adjustment to the central figure, overlooking all its trappings and drapery. An attempt is here made to re-state the Buddhist doctrine from this stand-point.

The first question that has aroused acutest controversy in regard to Buddhism is its view upon God. It has been roundly accused of atheism. It has been denounced as a religion

which has no God at one end and no soul at the other—a religion which drives man to suicide and hurls the suicide into everlasting annihilation. It is, therefore, necessary to examine how far these strictures are justifiable, and how far Buddhism has popularized the cult of atheism. But here, unfortunately, we are confronted with a difficulty, the statement of which yields a solution to the question. What do we understand by the term God—and what do we mean or imply by it? For, that word, though the basis of most religions, is never understood in the same sense by any two religions; nor indeed is it used in the same sense by any two sects of the same religion. It is, however, clear in what sense the philosopher understands it. He uses it in the sense of the first cause, the *causa causans*, the ultimate cause and creator of the universe.

But here again, the philosopher is confronted with a difficulty. For when he uses the words, he is not always conscious of the elasticity of their meaning; since the ultimate cause that produces a phenomenon need not necessarily be single and isolated. Take an instance: Water is produced by two elements—Hydrogen and Oxygen. These two combined, produce water. In fact, they do not produce it, but the moment they are combined, the product is water. What is then the cause of water? Hydrogen or Oxygen, or the combination of the two, or all the three taken together? Similar difficulties surround philosophic thought; and it is responsible for the unsatisfactory solutions which the scientist as well as the philosopher has to offer on the subject of the ultimate cause of the universe.

The fact is that with our limited intelligence, we cannot conceive of the unlimited universe, nor do we know enough of it to be able to assert with any degree of confidence, how it came into being and who created it. No human ratiocination can carry us beyond a stage where human intellect staggers and the search for further knowledge becomes a vain aspiration. But though knowledge fails, the thirst for knowledge

remains ; and it is partially or wholly satisfied according to the credulity of the person desiring to quench it.

Human ratiocination then ends in agnosticism, not atheism. The older philosophers made no such distinction. To them, as to those whose judgment is warped by religious prejudice, the two terms are inter-changeable and synonymous. But there is a world of difference between the two,—as much difference as there can be between ignorance and knowledge ; between a negative and a positive assertion. Now ignorance of the ultimate cause may proceed not only from ignorance of the unknown, but from knowledge of the limits of human reason. These two factors might operate at the same time ; but they do not necessarily do so ; since the bounds of human knowledge, though closed to human reason, are always open to human credulity and it accounts for the diversity of religious faiths. Buddha might have extended such bounds, by professing to reveal to man knowledge which he did not possess. Such revelations have been made by other Teachers. But what are their credentials ? Nothing beyond their own *ipse dixit* and a blind faith in their assertions. That such assertions do not always suffice to convince even the masses—is proved by the fact that resort is often had to miracles, as offering better credentials of the miracle-workers.

These are unfortunately facts which he who runs can see ; but people intoxicated by religious fervour refuse to see them. They argue to themselves and try to convince others that there is such a thing as Divine Revelation and that God does send down His emissaries from time to time to announce His existence and establish a *nexus* between Him and Man. But when we ask for his credentials, what have we got beyond his own word and some legerdemain practised or imputed to establish the *bona fides* of his claim ? But one asks—if the messenger of the High has come to awaken man, why cannot he produce better credentials and why does not the High come down Himself to announce Himself to the world and so put an end to all false religions and religious strife ? Such advents have often been promised but they have never been realised.

The fact is that the belief in God is only the sublimated form of a belief in the Devil. Both beliefs were the outcome of fear and many men now believe in the one as much as in the other, merely because they have been taught to do so from early life; and it may be that such beliefs through the course of numerous generations may have engendered an imposing atavism favourable to the illusion. The ministers of the gospel take good care to instil into the mind of the young their ideas of God and the Devil. These ideas become rooted in the mind and are often impervious to the voice of reason. But once we begin to analyse them, we are confronted with difficulties, since men have as little of the idea of God as they have of the hobgoblins of their childhood.

When, therefore, we speak of God we must be sure what we are thinking about. Are we thinking of a personal God or an impersonal spirit. If the former, what are his attributes? if the latter, how does it concern us? The God-followers in the revealed religions have been taught to believe in a personal God; but the moment one asks them to define His attributes, one is faced with a difficulty. The fact is that the evolution of the idea of a personal God is from a pure analogy. He is described as either the King—the Great King—or the Father of man. But the use of such expressions does not advance the cause of knowledge. It is like an ant crawling on the foot of an elephant describing him as a vast plain. It is true so far as it can see, but it is not *the* truth.

The description of God as the Father or the King is merely a guess that He is loving and just. But can He be loving without being just and is He just without being loving and is He one, at the sacrifice of the other? It raises a great problem and enormous possibilities for the intervention of a redeemer who offers to make himself a scapegoat for his followers. But is it just that the Great God should punish one for the sins of another and what is the limit to such vicarious punishment? The fact is that—once we lend ourselves to the whispers of faith we are lost in the storm of credulity. A number of redeemers arise to enlist our submission. They all alike promise absolution for our

wrongs and a Paradise for our abode. And what do we know of the Paradise? Is it yet another analogy—a glorified garden where the Blessed are said to dwell for ever. But how will they dwell? What becomes of their bodies and of their souls, if they have any? And what is the soul? And what is its connection with the body? Has it a consciousness apart from it and does it need it in the Paradise? If so, what is its function there?

These questions raise numerous others till they create a Chinese puzzle, the escape from which becomes impossible except under the tutelage of a priest. It is he who allays all doubts, quiets all longings, gratifies all desires. But is it all? No, it is not all. We start again: What is the relation of God to man? Even redeemers do not redeem but on terms. What are their terms? Whither do we come from—whither do we go? All religions have tried to solve the riddle of life. But are any two religions agreed upon a single question? And do the religionists tell us anything more about the Divine Government—anything that we can reason out and prove?

The question of God is the essence of religion, but it is the one question upon which human speculation has made no progress. The Greeks killed or exiled their philosophers who attempted to solve that problem and denied their gods. The Indians permitted and indeed encouraged speculation in that region. The Chinese thought and wrote upon it. But so far as our knowledge of God is concerned, we stand to-day where we stood 3,000 years ago. All speculation during this interval ends in a circle or in agnosticism. The rest is faith—and on questions of faith, one cannot reason, since faith begins where reason fails.

Faith has evolved two distinct theories of God. The one that He is personal, but without any attributes of personality—a contradiction in terms; another that He is a spirit possessing supreme power. The one is called Monotheism; the other leads to Pantheism. But Buddha was neither a monotheist nor a pantheist. He neither asserted the one, nor denied the other. And when he was confronted with those embarrassing

questions, his mind must have gone back to the days when he sat under the Bodhi tree—thinking, thinking, and thinking.

And when he died, he died thinking. He had not evolved any distinctive view of his own. His mind did not turn in that direction, because his doctrine of causation was complete without it. He started with a fact—the human suffering: he ends with its solution. He had set before himself one great problem, and he has found for it the one great solution. He regarded an excursus into any further question a digression, as much as if Euclid who sat down to prove a geometrical problem, had set about discovering the properties of matter. It may be that he did not go far enough, or if he did, he found himself in a dark room trying to find a thing which is not there. But such appears to be the whole scheme of his teachings. Six years of mental exercise in the then insoluble problems of life had warned him of the dangers of too wide a speculation. His method was essentially empiric. He analysed the root cause of all human suffering and he found it to be selfishness. He was struggling to find for it a cure; and he found it in his doctrine—the practice of selflessness. It was essentially an ethical problem, and to it he had offered an ethical solution. That problem carried him into metaphysical regions both backward and forward. But when he delved into them he entered a polemical field of speculation in which his doctrine appears most vulnerable. He essayed perhaps too far. But he could not have completed his doctrine, if he had stopped at the mere psychological issue. It would have resulted in utilitarianism and utilitarianism has never appealed to the masses, nor has it added by one jot to the sum total of human happiness.

Nevertheless, though he had no very clear views of his own—no doctrine to combat, no dogma to preach, he appears to have taken for granted that God existed and was ruler of the Paradise to which all souls went, on the completion of their cycle of life. His teachings shew this by evidence both positive and negative: of the former we have the following:—

"And when they⁽¹⁾ were thus seated the Blessed One gave thanks in these verses:—

"Whereso'er the prudent man shall take up his abode
Let him support there good and upright men of self-control.

Let him give gifts to all such deities as may be there.
Revered, they will revere him: honoured, they honour him again;
And gracious to him as a mother to her own, her only son.

And the man who has the grace of the gods, good fortune he beholds."⁽²⁾

On another occasion he was holding a discourse with a Brahman—Vashisth, to whom he addressed thus:—

"That man, Vashisth, born and brought up at Mansakat might, if he were asked the way to Mansakat, fall into doubt and difficulty; but to the *Tashagat*, when asked touching the path which leads to the world of Brahm⁽³⁾, there can be neither doubt nor difficulty. For Brahm, I know, Vashisth, and the world of Brahm, and the path which leads unto it. Yea, I know it even as one who had entered the Brahm world, and has been born within it."⁽⁴⁾

Before his Buddhhood his father's minister had asked him:

"Others say that creation comes from Ishwar.⁽⁵⁾ What need then is there of the effort of conscious soul.⁽⁶⁾ That which is the cause of the action of the world, is also determined as the cause of its ceasing to act".⁽⁷⁾ To which Buddh replied:

(1) That is, Sunidha and Vassakara—ministers of Magadh who had invited Buddh to a meal after which they sat down to hear his discourse—*Parinirvan* I—21; 11 S.B.E., 20.

(2) *Parinirvan* I—31; 11 S.B.E., 20.

(3) Sk. *Brahm* "God" "The Creator." "The Brahm is omni-present and unchanging. He who knows this obtains omni-present and unchangeable happiness"—*Upanishads* I S.B.E., 46 "Their (the Jews') monotheism was perhaps indepen-

dently evolved; but the Buddhists at least showed a contemporary monotheism Mr. Huth, in *Life etc. of Buckle*, p 288 quoted per Rhys. Davids' *Intro. Devigga Sutta* 11 S.B.E., 164.

(4) *Devigga Sutta*—1—48; 11 S.B.E., 186.

(5) Sk. *Ishwar*—the chief Ruler, "the supreme Creator", "God"

(6) The reference here is to "*Purush*", the "Person", "the Ego."

(7) *Buddhcharitra* IX—58; 49 S.B.E. 100.

"It is not for me to accept a theory which depends on the unknown and is all controverted, and which involved a hundred prepossessions; which wise man would go by another's belief? Mankind are like the blind directed in the darkness by the

Nevertheless when enlightenment came to him "The King of the Devas carried the news thereof joyfully to the Deva-heavens; and gods, men, and demons watered it with reverential circumambulations."⁽¹⁾ And when he took his last repast which culminated in his death, he told his host of the poisonous food he had eaten which no one even in God's heaven would digest: "I see no one, Kunda, on earth nor in Mar's heaven, nor in Brahm's heaven.....by whom when he has eaten it, that food can be assimilated."⁽²⁾ In the *Dhammpad* it is said: "If thou hast learned the destruction of the Shanskar, thou knowest the uncreated."⁽³⁾ Referring to this Prof. Max Muller remarks: "This surely shows that even for Buddha, a something existed which is not made, and which, therefore, is imperishable and eternal."⁽⁴⁾ On this Dr. Oldenberg adds the following pendant. "It appears to me, that we can find in the expression another meaning, and if we consider it in connection with the Buddhist theory of the world, we must find another meaning." The other meaning he suggests is a negative meaning that to the Buddhist asking after the eternal is the same thing as asking after the cessation of the impermanent."⁽⁵⁾ But this is scarcely what Max Muller was dealing with.

And there are numerous other references to Brahm and the gods, to heaven and its supreme bliss, to which the discourse is devoted.⁽⁷⁾ This will be adverted to later. For the present the frequent references to God and heaven in his discourses, and the fact that their existence had been categorically denied in the *Sankhya* philosophy which he had studied, makes one pause

(1) *Buddh Churitra*, IX—64; 49 S.B.E. 101, 102.

(2) *Ib.* XV—66; 49 S.B.E. 166.

(3) *Pari-Nirvan* IV—19; 11 S.B.E. 73.

(4) *Dhammpad* V—323.

(5) *Intro. I C.P.* XLIV; quoted by Oldenberg *Buddhism* 283 f.n.

(6) *Buddhism* 283, 284, f.n.

(7) *Sukhavasi* ("The land of Bliss.")—49 S.B.E. 1-75.

before committing him to a positive atheism. It is true that his references to God are more or less casual ; it is equally true that early in his life when he was questioned about God's creation he had expressed a doubt ; but the fact that he never committed himself to a definite view upon it, nor indeed adverted to that subject again does not show that he was atheistic, but only that he had constructed his system without having recourse to the intervention of God. It is perfectly consistent with his belief in God—a just God who sets his law in motion and leaves men free to obey or disobey it.

This is all that can be said on the question with reference to his direct teaching.

So much for the positive evidence. Turning next to the negative evidence tending to the same conclusion, it has been said that his system was atheistic, in that it took no account of God. But a system cannot be considered atheistic, merely because it is complete independently of God. Buddha believed in self-help. He was a believer in the free will of man. He was averse to the introduction of a *tertium quid* in what he had conceived to be his purely rationalistic teaching. His system therefore, could not be denounced as atheistic any more than the solution of a geometrical problem can be called atheistic, because it applies to its solution the pure light of reason.

In order to clear the ground it would be just as well to refer to other controversial points in this connection ; since an amount of unreasoning prejudice has been created in the popular mind on the subjects dearest to man's heart, ascribing to him a teaching which he did not teach and which, indeed, he categorically denied. Such is the view commonly held and generally expressed by European critics of his system that his Nirvan is annihilation pure and simple and that Buddhist gospel of peace was in reality a gospel of annihilation.⁽¹⁾ Now it may be said in favour of this error that it is as old as Buddha himself ; and one of his interlocutors had put to him this pointed question : “ And again Siha, there is a way in which one speaking truly could say of me. The Saman Gautam

(1) Oldenberg—*Buddhism* 271 ; St. Hilaire—*Buddhism*, 175.

maintains annihilating ; he teaches the doctrine of annihilation ; and in this doctrine he trains his disciples.”⁽¹⁾ “ And in which way is it, Siha, that one speaking truly could say (this) of me : I proclaim, Siha, the annihilation of lust, of ill-will, of delusion ; I proclaim the annihilation of the manifold conditions (of heart) which are evil and not good.”⁽²⁾

This is, therefore, conclusive of his intention. It will have to be seen later whether his doctrine leads to no other result.

M. St. Hilaire thinks that Nirvan is annihilation and implies atheism.⁽³⁾ That it does not imply atheism seems to be clear. It remains to be seen whether it implies annihilation. Truly Buddha had reflected to himself under the tree of knowledge : “ Difficult will it be for men to grasp the law of causality, the chain of causes and effects. And this also will be very hard for them to grasp, the coming of all conformations to an end, the loosening from everything earthly, the extinction of desire, the cessation of longing, the end, the Nirvan.”

The third question which has aroused controversy is the question relating to the existence and nature of Soul. A direct question on this point was put by King Milinda : “ Is there such a thing, Nagzen, as the soul ? ” “ In the highest sense, O King, there is no such things.”⁽⁴⁾

Nagzen's answer referred to it in “ the highest sense.” But in how many senses is the term not used ! “ Soul ” in Sanskrit literally means the breath. But it has come to mean the self-conscious centre of human personality. The Vedantist regarded it as emanation of the divine spirit, something distinct from and independent of the body in which it inheres. So did Plato⁽⁵⁾ and the Jews.⁽⁶⁾ It was believed to be both immaterial and indestructible, everlasting and immortal—a view which Christ adopted⁽⁷⁾ as Spirit.⁽⁸⁾ Understood in this sense, Buddha denied its existence. People generally mistake a mere consciousness for soul. It is, however, a mere mental abstraction, as much an abstraction as any generic term. “ This is

(1) *M.V.* VI—31.5 ; 17 S.B.E. 111.

(2) *M.V.* VI—31.7 ; 17 S.B.E. 112.

(3) Quoted *Supra Buddhism*, 175.

(4) *Milinda* III—6 ; 35 S.B.E. 111.

(5) *Phaedrus*.

(6) *Genesis* II—7.

(7) *Math.* X—28.

(8) *Math.* XXVII—50 ; *John* XIX—30.

my body, the material framed out of the four elements, begotten by my father and mother.....but that is my consciousness, which clings firmly thereto, is joined to it, like a precious stone, beautiful and valuable, octahedral, well-polished, clear and pure, adorned with all perfection to which a string is attached, blue or yellow, red or white, or a yellowish band.”⁽¹⁾ But the question does not end here. It is only in this sense that Buddha denied the existence of the soul; but it must not be thence concluded that he had thereby committed himself to materialism. On the other hand, the sense in which he denied the existence of the soul, may be taken equally to have denied the existence of the body.

Indeed, the existence of soul was an integral part of his system, for upon it he based his theory of re-incarnation. This he had to do as a matter of metaphysical necessity. But it was not his immediate purpose, for he had to investigate quite a different matter,—namely, the cause of suffering and the means for its extinction. This is how he formulated the question which is the corner-stone of his system: and of which he had discovered the solution under the tree of knowledge. “Then the Blessed One (at the end of these seven days) during the first watch of the night fixed his mind upon the chain of causation, in direct and in reverse order: From Ignorance⁽²⁾ spring the *Sanskars*,⁽³⁾ from the *Sanskar* springs Consciousness, from Consciousness springs Name and Form, from Name and Form spring the six Provinces (of the six senses),⁽⁴⁾ from the six Provinces springs Contact, from Contact springs Sensation, from Sensation springs Thirst (or Desire), from Thirst springs Attachment, from Attachment springs Existence, from Existence springs Birth, from Birth spring Old Age and Death, grief, lamentation, suffering, dejection, and despair. Such is the origination of this whole mass of suffering.

“Again, by the destruction of Ignorance which consists in the complete absence of lust, the *Sanskars* are destroyed;

(1) *Samanphal Sutta*.

(2) *Ignorance* is explained to mean “Not to know suffering, not to know the cause of suffering” 13 S.B.E., 75 f.n.(2).

(3) *Sanskar*—production.

(4) Procreation, i.e., eye, ear, nose, tongue, body (or the faculty of touch) and mind—in modern Psychology they all resolve themselves into a single thing—touch.

by the destruction of the *Sanskars*, Consciousness is destroyed ; by the destruction of Consciousness, Name and Form are destroyed ; by the destruction of Name and Form, the six Provinces are destroyed ; by the destruction of the six Provinces, Contact is destroyed ; by the destruction of Contact, Sensation is destroyed ; by the destruction of Sensation, Thirst is destroyed ; by the destruction of Thirst, Attachment is destroyed ; by the destruction of Attachment, Existence is destroyed ; by the destruction of Existence, Birth is destroyed ; by the destruction of Birth, Old Age and Death, grief, lamentation, suffering, dejection and despair are destroyed. Such is the cessation of this whole mass of suffering.”⁽¹⁾

The above is in short the whole Buddhistic creed. It explains the cause of suffering and provides the cure. It is the first Buddhist formula ; and this is the second :—

“ This, O monks, is the sacred truth of the origin of suffering : it is the thirst (or desire) for being which leads from birth to birth ; together with lust and desire, which finds gratification here and there ; the thirst for pleasure, the thirst for being, the thirst for power.

“ This, O monks, is the sacred truth of the extinction of suffering : the extinction of this thirst by complete annihilation of desire, letting it go, expelling it, separating oneself from it, giving no room.”

And in so stating the Law, Buddha was stating an elementary truth. It is desire or the thirst for pleasure which is responsible for births and the perpetuation of the human species. If that desire can be effectively curbed, there would be no births, and no deaths and in a very short time man will cease to be.

Buddha states his propositions in the pedantic style of his age. He throws them into a form of Sorites ; but, as such, it is logically faulty and all he wishes to convey is this : “ Oblivious of the suffering to which life is subject, man begets children, and is thus the cause of old age and death. If he

(1) *Mahavagga* I—1.2 ; 13 S.B.E. 75-78.

would only realize what suffering he would add to by his act, he would desist from the procreation of children; and so stop the operation of old age and death."

The first noble truth is that existence involves suffering, which became the subject of the following discourse: "The world of transmigration, my disciples, has its beginning in eternity. No origin can be perceived, from which beings start, and hampered by ignorance, fettered by craving, stray and wander. Which think you are more—the tears which you have shed as you strayed and wandered on this long journey, grieving and weeping because you were bound to what you hated and separated from what you loved—which are more, these tears, or the waters in the four oceans? A mother's death, a son's death, a daughter's death, loss of kinsmen, loss of property, sickness, all these you have endured through long ages—and while you felt these losses and strayed and wandered on this long journey, grieving and weeping because you were bound to what you hated and separated from what you loved, the tears that you shed are more than the water in the four oceans."⁽¹⁾

The fallacy of this reasoning has already been adverted to. Life does involve unhappiness, but is it all unhappiness? That it is not, was too well known to the Master who had warned his monks against being caught in the net of worldly delight. However, it is one view and shared by philosophers like Schopenhauer, emperors like Marcus Aurelius and the Christian divines, like Pope Innocent III.⁽²⁾ To Buddha it was a religious faith and he made it the corner-stone of his philosophy.

His second truth is the origin of suffering which he ascribes to Desire (*Tanha*—lit. "Thirst.") The thirst or craving for life, in the wide sense, engenders a desire for pleasure which results in procreation, the craving for existence in the dying man which is translated into a re-birth,⁽³⁾ the craving for the wealth, power and gratification of personal ambition, which

⁽¹⁾ *Samyutta-Nikkaya* XV—2.

⁽²⁾ *Maj-Nik.* 120; *Mūlinda* 11—8; 35

⁽³⁾ *Decontemptu Mundi Pat Lat. OC S.B.E.* 50.

leads to misery and disappointment. It is what Carlyle called "the divine discontent" which according to Buddh is the root of all human misery in this life. The chain of causation with its twelve links is only explanatory of this truth. It is the wheel of life. It ascribes the perpetuation of consciousness in a re-birth to a mere desire for the continuance of life. The ignorance of this fact is the third sacred truth. The creature born in fulfilment of a prenatal desire for existence is in no sense the identical self. It is a new personality, but come into existence because of the expression of a desire for re-birth. The truth of the cessation of suffering must then be grasped by one who wishes to free himself from the penalty of a re-birth.

But these noble truths though essential for the acquisition of knowledge are as nothing to the fourth and last truth which leads to the extinction of suffering, and gives practical directions for that purpose: It is the Noble Eightfold path consisting of right views, right aspirations, right speech, right conduct, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness and right rapture.

Buddh assumed that life is a suffering and its only solution is "no life". But is life a suffering? That it is full of suffering, in that desires arise, but remain ungratified, hopes are disappointed, and even for those who have suffered least and enjoyed most of life, the only path open is that to the grave. Even to those who concede the major premise how does the course suggested prevent suffering? Only there is no one to suffer, for man has committed race-suicide. The underlying assumption made by Buddh, therefore, appears to be too wide. There is, no doubt, that he saw death and disease, pain and suffering, and the pathetic infirmities of old age. But he never realized that both pleasure and pain are relative terms, and that there can be no pleasure without pain. For after all, pain awakens desire, and desire, let us assume, leads to births and deaths. But Buddh's plan would end human existence before it would end human suffering. It was never a remedy for the conquest of suffering. That remedy ■ found in the manly struggle with it and not in the craven surrender of self. That Buddh himself was not slow to

would only realize what suffering he would add to by his act, he would desist from the procreation of children; and so stop the operation of old age and death."

The first noble truth is that existence involves suffering, which became the subject of the following discourse: "The world of transmigration, my disciples, has its beginning in eternity. No origin can be perceived, from which beings start, and hampered by ignorance, fettered by craving, stray and wander. Which think you are more—the tears which you have shed as you strayed and wandered on this long journey, grieving and weeping because you were bound to what you hated and separated from what you loved—which are more, these tears, or the waters in the four oceans? A mother's death, a son's death, a daughter's death, loss of kinsmen, loss of property sickness, all these you have endured through long ages—and while you felt these losses and strayed and wandered on this long journey, grieving and weeping because you were bound to what you hated and separated from what you loved, the tears that you shed are more than the water in the four oceans."⁽¹⁾

The fallacy of this reasoning has already been adverted to. Life does involve unhappiness, but is it all unhappiness? That it is not, was too well known to the Master who had warned his monks against being caught in the net of worldly delight. However, it is one view and shared by philosophers like Schopenhauer, emperors like Marcus Aurelius and the Christian divines, like Pope Innocent III.⁽²⁾ To Buddha it was a religious faith and he made it the corner-stone of his philosophy.

His second truth is the origin of suffering which he ascribes to Desire (*Tanha*—lit. "Thirst.") The thirst or craving for life, in the wide sense, engenders a desire for pleasure which results in procreation, the craving for existence in the dying man which is translated into a re-birth,⁽³⁾ the craving for the wealth, power and gratification of personal ambition, which

(1) *Samyutta-Nikkaya* XV—3.

(2) *Maj-Nik.* 120; *Mūlinda* II—6; 35

(3) *Decontemptu Mundi Pat Lat.* OC S.B.E. 50.

XVII *Cols.* 701-748.

leads to misery and disappointment. It is what Carlyle called "the divine discontent" which according to Buddha is the root of all human misery in this life. The chain of causation with its twelve links is only explanatory of this truth. It is the wheel of life. It ascribes the perpetuation of consciousness in a re-birth to a mere desire for the continuance of life. The ignorance of this fact is the third sacred truth. The creature born in fulfilment of a prenatal desire for existence is in no sense the identical self. It is a new personality, but come into existence because of the expression of a desire for re-birth. The truth of the cessation of suffering must then be grasped by one who wishes to free himself from the penalty of a re-birth.

But these noble truths though essential for the acquisition of knowledge are as nothing to the fourth and last truth which leads to the extinction of suffering, and gives practical directions for that purpose: It is the Noble Eightfold path consisting of right views, right aspirations, right speech, right conduct, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness and right rapture.

Buddha assumed that life is a suffering and its only solution is "no life". But is life a suffering? That it is full of suffering, in that desires arise, but remain ungratified, hopes are disappointed, and even for those who have suffered least and enjoyed most of life, the only path open is that to the grave. Even to those who concede the major premise how does the course suggested prevent suffering? Only there is no one to suffer, for man has committed race-suicide. The underlying assumption made by Buddha, therefore, appears to be too wide. There is, no doubt, that he saw death and disease, pain and suffering, and the pathetic infirmities of old age. But he never realized that both pleasure and pain are relative terms, and that there can be no pleasure without pain. For after all, pain awakens desire, and desire, let us assume, leads to births and deaths. But Buddha's plan would end human existence before it would end human suffering. It was never a remedy for the conquest of suffering. That remedy is found in the manly struggle with it and not in the craven surrender of self. That Buddha himself was not slow to

perceive the *reductio ad absurdum* of his own teaching—is manifest from his sermon on the middle path delivered to his five old disciples whom he reclaimed at Benares: “There are two extremes, O Bhikkhus, which he who has given up the world, ought to avoid. What are these two extremes? A life given to pleasures, devoted to pleasures and lusts: this ■ degrading, sensual, vulgar, ignoble, and profitless; and a life given to mortifications: this is painful, ignoble, and profitless. By avoiding these two extremes, O Bhikkhus, the Tathagat has gained the knowledge of the Middle Path which leads to insight, which leads to wisdom, which conduces to calm, to knowledge, to the Sambodhi, to Nirvan.

“Which, O Bhikkhus, is this Middle Path, the knowledge of which the Tathagat has gained, which leads to insight, which leads to wisdom, which conduces to calm, to knowledge, to the Sambodhi, to Nirvan? It is the holy eight-fold Path—namely, Right Belief, Right Aspiration, Right Speech, Right Conduct, Right Means of Livelihood, Right Endeavour, Right Memory, Right Meditation. This, O Bhikkhus, is the Middle Path, the knowledge of which the Tathagat has gained, which leads to insight, which leads to wisdom, which conduces to calm, to knowledge, to the Sambodhi, to Nirvan.”⁽¹⁾

This sermon, then, has the effect of reducing the doctrine within reasonable limits. It avoids the extremes of “No life—no Death”, with which he started the enunciation of his doctrine. He does not qualify his dogma, but ascribes to it a qualified meaning. So construed, his doctrine removes from it the assumption of unqualified pessimism which it is supposed to inculcate. It is true, that life is a suffering and that life involves suffering are two things apart; but the difference between them is a difference of degree; whether the sum-total of human life is a life with preponderating pleasure or suffering ■ one upon which no philosopher can dogmatize—though philosophers have become sharply divided upon the question, as if in the varied conditions of life there were no other possibility. Death and disease are regarded as sufferings, but

(1) *M. V.* 1—6-17, 18, 13 *S.B.E.* 94, 95.

why should death be called a suffering when it puts an end to suffering is another question. Could Buddha have said, can any one say that if Death be eliminated from life, suffering shall cease? Would not the suffering grow: and would not a point then be reached when eternal life itself would be a prolonged and an unendurable suffering? But in the present condition, because death cannot be averted, man regards Death as his worst enemy. But does it not shew that he regards life with all its sufferings as a life to which he is dearly attached and from which he is loth to part?

Human speculation has not yet fathomed the depths of the hereafter. And it may be that he will never be able to do so. It cannot then be asserted that life is a resultant suffering and that life without death and disease would not become too monotonous.

Soul or No-Soul.

Buddhist view on Soul is a negation. Buddha has again tried to shew that such a thing as soul, so far as human consciousness is aware, never existed and can never exist. Not only does he deny its existence in man, but he equally denies its existence in the gods. But the qualifications attending his denial must be understood. As previously stated, Soul means "the breath" and the Vedantist asserts that it is the breath of God, that it is an immaterial principle distinct from body and analogous in nature to the divine essence which has created and pervades the universe. Being a divine emanation, it returns to the divine soul upon its leaving the body. "He who beholds all beings in the Self, and the Self in all beings, he never turns away from It."⁽¹⁾ "All this, whatsoever moves on earth, is to be hidden in the Lord (the Self). When thou hast surrendered all this, then thou mayest enjoy."⁽²⁾ "He who knows at the same time both the cause and the

⁽¹⁾ *Vajrasani Samhita Upanishad* § 6,
18. B. E. 312.

⁽²⁾ *Ib.* § 1, *Ib.* 311

destruction (the perishable body), overcomes Death by destruction (the perishable body) and obtains immortality through (knowledge), the true cause.”⁽¹⁾ “All this is Brahman. Let a man meditate on that (visible world) as beginning, ending and breathing in it the Brahman.”⁽²⁾

“He is myself within the heart, smaller than a corn of rice, smaller than a corn of barley, smaller than a mustard seed, smaller than a canary seed or the kernel of the canary seed. He also is myself within the heart, greater than the earth, greater than the sky, greater than heaven, greater than all these worlds.”⁽³⁾ This is a pure and simple pantheism. The universe is imbued with the spirit of God; and so is man. That spirit is supreme. All things emanate therefrom and into it return. It is equally the Platonic view that the soul is an immaterial and indestructible substance—a view adopted alike by the Christians and the Jews.

Plato puts into the mouth of Socrates his argument in proof of the immortality of soul. He says: “Every soul is immortal: for whatever is continually moved is immortal; but that which moves another and is moved by another, when it ceases to move, ceases to live. Therefore, that only which moves itself, since it does not quit itself, never ceases to be moved, but is also the source and beginning of motion to all other things that are moved. But a beginning is uncreate: for every thing that is created must necessarily be created from a beginning, but a beginning itself from nothing whatever; for if a beginning were created from anything, it would not be a beginning.

“Since then, it is uncreate, it must also of necessity be indestructible; for should a beginning perish, it could neither itself be ever created from anything, nor anything else from it, since all things must be created from a beginning. Thus then the beginning of motion is that which moves itself; and this can neither perish, nor be created, or all heaven and all

(1) *Vajrasani Samhita Upanishad*, § 14; 1 S. B. E. 48.
Ib. 313. (2) *Ib.* III-14-3; *Ib.* 48.
 (3) *Chhandogya-Upanishad* *Ib.* III-14-1;

creation must collapse and come to a stand-still, and never again have any means whereby it may be moved or created.

"Since then, it appears that which is moved by itself is immortal; no one will be ashamed to say that this is the very essence and true notion of the soul. For every body which is moved from without, is soul-less, but that which is moved from within of itself, possesses a soul, since this is the very nature of soul. But if this be the case,—that there is nothing else which moves itself except soul, soul must necessarily be both uncreate and immortal. This then may suffice for its immortality."⁽¹⁾—A *petitio principii* both the Vedantist and the Buddhist would exclaim!

Buddh, of course combated this view. He asked to himself the following question. How do we know about anything?—only through the five ⁽²⁾ gate-ways of knowledge, eyes, ears, nose, taste and touch. All knowledge of being, that is what we are, and becoming what we become is communicated to us. Now these five senses produce different impressions on me. If I close my eyes I don't see; the ears don't hear—and so on. Therefore, these impressions produce in me certain sensations; and consciousness is nothing more than a bundle of these sensations. But these sensations keep on changing from moment to moment; and, in fact, in order that I may continually see the impact of light must continuously fall upon the retina. To use the metaphor which Buddh himself used, we are like a flowing river; at no single moment is its water the same, but still it retains its identity; or to use a modern metaphor, we are like the motion-pictures in the cinematograph, which produces upon one the impression of a racing horse from the blind of thousands of pictures, falling upon the eye in quick succession. But where is the horse as we see him? Take again the case of sleep. When are we without our consciousness? And when we dream dreams, how different is our consciousness then from what we consider to be our real consciousness! For compendiousness of expression,

⁽¹⁾ *Phædrus*, 51-53; 1 *Plato (Boku)* 311.
322.

⁽²⁾ In another place he mentions 5; mind being the last.

we speak of the aggregate of impressions as "consciousness" and this consciousness we speak of sometimes as "Ego," "The Soul," "The Spirit," "The Mind." But what do we know of the noumenon underlying this consciousness? And what is true of the mind is equally true of the body. It is an ever-changing phenomenon, only known through the five gate-ways of knowledge.

Buddhist philosophy is often presented in the un-translated Buddhist jargon, with the result that the learner feels readily confused, but seldom convinced that he has grasped its essential principle. But in plain prose, this is all that Buddha intended to teach; and his teachings may be summed up in the following dicta, namely:—

- (1) All knowledge arises from consciousness.
- (2) That consciousness begins and ends with sensation.
- (3) Therefore consciousness is nothing more than sensation.

That is the first syllogism. And here is the second:—

- (1) All sensations are impermanent.
- (2) Body is such sensation.
- (3) Therefore it is impermanent.

That body cannot be known apart from sensations is clear. They proceed in quick succession. Take for instance,—the light; it travels at the rate of 18,000 miles a second. Therefore, there is no such thing as a fixed light. What we see is nothing more than a succession of impacts of light, and at no two moments are we the same; since these moments of fresh impacts must be added to our consciousness, therefore, we are an ever-changing object, or an object with an ever-changing identity.

The basis for the body and the soul is the same. It is not different; and if one says that the soul is immortal, one must equally predicate that the body is immortal, which would be absurd. Consequently, there is no sound basis for the assertion that the soul is distinct from the body, is ethereal and immortal. On the other hand, if one regards "consciousness" as the soul, then it exists as much as the body; but consciousness is nothing

more than a bundle of sensations, produced on or retained by the brain. It may be called the mind ; but the brain disappearing, the mind also disappears. If it doesn't, what evidence have we that it survives the body ? And why should it, any more than the five organs of the senses which have perished with the body ? What functions can it perform without those organs ?

This is not materialism, since Buddha does not admit the existence of matter. It is not the doctrine of *Maya*, because Buddha has no warranty for conceding the existence of an all-pervading spirit, nor was he prepared to dogmatize with the Vedantist—that all the world is a dream, a mirage, a will-o'-the-wisp. Nor is he prepared to admit the existence of Brahm as something distinct from the universe. The 'I' of Brahm is the 'I' of man and both are illusory. This question was, early in his studies, put to him by Araḍḍi, who asked : " What is that Self which perceives the actions of the five roots of the mind, touch, smell, taste, sight and hearing ? What is that which is active in the two ways of motion in the hands and in the feet ?

" The problem of the soul appears in the expressions ' I say,' ' I know and perceive,' ' I come ', and ' I go ' or ' I will stay here. ' The soul is not the body : it is not thy eye, not thy ear, not thy nose, not thy tongue ; nor is it thy mind. The ' I ' is he who feels the touch in thy body. The ' I ' is the smeller in the nose, the taster in the tongue, the seer in the eye, the hearer in the ear, and the thinker in the mind. The ' I ' moves thy hands and thy feet. The ' I ' is thy soul. Doubt in the existence of the soul is irreligious, and without discerning this truth there is no way of salvation. Deep speculation will easily involve the mind : it leads to confusion and unbelief ; but a purification of the soul leads to the way of escape. True deliverance is reached by removing from the crowd and leading a hermit's life, depending entirely on alms for food. Putting away all desire and clearly recognising the non-existence of matter, we reach a state of perfect emptiness. Here we find the condition of immaterial life. As the munja grass, when freed from its horny case, or as the wild bird escapes from its

prison, so the soul goes liberating itself from all limitations, finds perfect release. This is true deliverance, but those only who will have deep faith will learn."

Bodhisatv found no satisfaction in these teachings. He replied: "People are in bondage, because they have not yet removed the idea of 'I.'"

"The thing and its quality are different in our thought, but not in reality. Heat is different from fire in our thought, but you cannot remove heat from fire in reality. You say that you can remove the qualities and leave the thing, but if you think your theory to the end, you will find that this is not so.

"Is not man an organism of many aggregates? Do we not consist of various skandhas, as our sages call them? Man consists of the material form of sensation, of thought, of dispositions and lastly, of understanding. That which men call the 'ego' when they say 'I am' is not an entity behind the skandhas; it originates by the co-operation of the skandhas. There is mind; there is sensation and thought, and there is truth; and truth is mind when it walks in the path of righteousness. But there is no separate ego-soul, outside or behind the thought of man. He who believes that the ego is a distinct being has no correct conception of things. The very search for the atman is wrong; it is a wrong start and it will lead you in the false direction.

"How much confusion of thought comes from our interest in self, and from our vanity when thinking 'I am so great', or 'I have done this wonderful deed?' The thought of your 'I' stands between your rational nature and truth; banish it, and then you will see things as they are. He who thinks correctly will rid himself of ignorance and acquire wisdom. The ideas 'I am' and 'I shall be' or 'I shall not be' do not occur to a clear thinker.

"Moreover, if your ego remains, how can you attain true deliverance? ■ the 'ego' ■ to be reborn in any of the three worlds, be it in hell, upon earth, or be it even in heaven, we shall

meet again and again the same inevitable doom of existence. We shall be implicated in egotism and sin.

"All combination is subject to separation, and we cannot escape birth, disease, old age, and death. Is this a final escape?"

Arañ said: "Do you not see around you the effects of karm? What makes men different in character, station, possession, and fate? It is their karm, and karm includes merit and demerit. The transmigration of the soul is subject to its karm. We inherit from former existences the evil effects of our evil deeds and the good effects of our good deeds. If that were not so, how could we be different?"

The Tathagat meditated deeply on the problems of transmigration and karm, and found the truth that lies in them.

"The doctrine of karm," he said, "is undeniable, for every effect has its cause. What a man soweth, he shall reap, and what we reap we must have sown in our previous lives.

"I see that the transmission of soul is subject to the law of cause and effect, for the fates of men are of their own making. But I see no transmigration of the 'I.'

"Is not this individuality of mine a combination, material as well as mental? Is it not made up of qualities that sprang into being by a gradual evolution. The five roots of sense-perception in this organism have come from ancestors who performed these functions. The ideas which I think, came to me partly from others who thought them, and partly they rise from combination of these ideas in my own mind. Those who used the same sense-organs and thought the same ideas before I was composed into this individuality of mine—are my previous existences; they are my ancestors as much as 'I' of yesterday am the father of 'I' of to-day, and the karm of my past deeds conditions the fate of my present existence.

"Supposing there were an *atman* that performs the actions of the senses, then if the door of sight were torn down and the eye plucked out, that *atman* would be able to peep through the larger aperture and see the forms of its surroundings better and more clearly than before. It would be able to hear sounds

better of the ears were torn away ; smell better, ■ the nose were cut off ; taste better, ■ the tongue were pulled out ; and feel better, if the body were destroyed.

“ I observe the preservation and transmission of soul ; I perceive the truth of karm, but see no *atman* whom your doctrine makes the doer of your deeds. There is re-birth without the transmigration of self. For this *atman*, this self, this ego in the ‘ I say ’ and in the ‘ I will ’ is an illusion. If this self were a reality, how could there be an escape from selfhood ? The terror of hell would be infinite, and no release could be granted. The evils of existence would not be due to our ignorance and sin, but would constitute the very nature of our being.” (1)

And later on when he obtained the enlightenment, he adverted to the same subject in his sermon to the five disciples.

“ And the Blessed One thus spoke to the five Bhikkhus :
= The body (Rupe), O Bhikkhus, is not the self. If the body, O Bhikkhus, were the self, the body would not be subject to disease, and we should be able to say : ‘ Let my body be such and such a one, let my body not be such and such a one.’ But since the body, O Bhikkhus, is not the self, therefore the body is subject to disease, and we are therefore not able to say : ‘ Let my body be such and such a one, let my body not be such and such ■ one.’

“Sensation (*Vedana*), O Bhikkhus is not the self,.....(&c)
Perception (*Sanna*) is not the self.....The *Sankharas* are not the self.....Consciousness (*Vijnan*) (*Gyan*) is not the self.....(&c).

“ Now what do you think, O Bhikkhus, is the body permanent or perishable ? ”

“ It is perishable, Lord.”

“ And that which is perishable, does that cause pain or joy ? ”

“ It causes pain, Lord.”

(1) P. Carus: *Gospel of Buddhism* 24, 24-26.

“ And that which is perishable, painful, subject to change, is it possible to regard that in this way : this is mine, this am I, this is myself ? ”

“ That is impossible, Lord. ”

“ Is sensation permanent or perishable ? ”

“ No, Lord. ”

“ Therefore, O Bhikkhus, whatever body has been, will be and is now, belonging or not belonging to sentient beings, gross or subtle, inferior or superior, distant or near, all that body is not mine, is not me, is not my self : this—it should be considered by right knowledge according to the truth.”⁽¹⁾

That Buddha's views on the subject were uncompromising and clear is evident from all his writings. Reference has already been made to his earliest pronouncements on the subject. In his later discourses he has only re-emphasized those views. For example a Bhikkhu—Sati, had been detected preaching at variance with his doctrine. He had said : “ It is mind which persists and is re-born after death unchanged ”.⁽²⁾ The Sangh protest and report the matter to the Master. He questions him—

B. “ Is this true Sati ? ”

S. “ Yes, Lord, so do I understand you to teach. ”

B. “ What, Sati, is that consciousness ? ”

S. “ That speaker and feeler, Sir, who experiences the result of good and evil deeds done here or there. ”

B. “ And then, foolish man, from whom have you got such a doctrine as one of mine ? Have I not taught you by many methods that consciousness is from a cause, except from a cause there is no coming into being of consciousness.....And consciousness is reckoned only in accordance with the conditions causing it ;—visual cognition from sight and seen object, idea from mind and mental object, just as fire is different according to its fuel. ”

“ Do you see that this has *become*, Bhikkhus ? ”

⁽¹⁾ *M. V.* 1-6-38-44 ; 13 *S. B. E.* 100, 101. destruction of craving ” 38).

⁽²⁾ *Majjhima-Nikay Sutta* (“ The

“ Do you see that the becoming is according to the stimulus (literally “ the food ”) ?

“ Do you see that if the stimulus cease, then that which has become ceases, Bhikkhus ?”

On another occasion Buddha put up for a night at a potter's house in Rajgrah when he met another monk Pukkusati, ex-King of Taxila, who according to tradition had abdicated and turned a Buddhist and an ascetic on learning its doctrines from King Bimbeshwar who had sent them inscribed on golden plates. Neither knew the identity of the other and seeing him Buddha invited him to spend the night with him to which he readily consented. The ex-King was the first to disclose his identity. He told his companion the facts of his conversion and that it was the Exalted One—Gautam of the Shakyas whose Dhamm had so moved him, adding : “ Where, Bhikkhu is now that Gautam ?” “ In the North country, friend, at Savatthi.”

P. “ Have you seen him ? If you saw him, would you know him ?”

B. “ Nay, friend, if I saw him I should not know him. Listen, Bhikkhu, I will teach you Dhamm.”

P. “ So be it, friend.”

And Buddha began—Man consists of six constituent elements—namely, earth, water, heat, air, space and consciousness ; he has six fields of contact with the external world (the sixth being the mind) ; in 18 ways he is affected by the world, and there is a four-fold platform, whereon if he stand, the surgings of fancy make no headway, and he is fit to be called sage and saint. That platform is (1) true knowledge,—how to destroy all sorrow ; (2) True Nirvan ; (3) True resignation, namely, of all conditions leading to re-birth ; (4) True Peace ; i.e., the tranquillization of lust, hate and illusion.

As he ceased Pukkusati fell at the stranger's feet exclaiming “ I have found the Master ! I have found the Perfectly Enlightened One.”

In the Buddhistic doctrine the law of causation plays an important part. But to a Buddhist that cause is only another name for consciousness.

“ In this monk, O disciples, who thus guards himself and rules his consciousness, who is immovably intent thereon in holy effort and is steadfast in self-culture, there arises a sensation of pleasure. Then he knows as follows : ‘ In me has arisen this pleasurable sensation ; this has arisen from a cause, not without a cause. Where lies this cause ? It lies in this body of mine. But this body of mine is impermanent, has become (or, been formed), been produced by causes. A pleasurable sensation, the cause of which lies in the impermanent, originated cause—produced body, how can it be permanent ? ’ Thus, as well with regard to the body as to the pleasurable sensation, he commits himself to the contemplation of impermanence, transitoriness, evanescence, renunciation, cessation, resignation. While he commits himself to the contemplation of impermanence, etc., as well with regard to the body as to the pleasurable sensation, he desists from all yearning (propensity) based on the body and on pleasurable sensation.”

“ Is there such a thing as soul ” asked King Milinda to the sage Nagsen : “ None in the highest sense of the term ” was Nagsen’s reply.⁽¹⁾ “ What is it then ” he asked : “ Is it not like a man sitting in his house and looking out of his five windows ? ”

Nagsen—“ I will tell you about the five doors,⁽²⁾ great King, listen, and give heed attentively. If the living principle within sees forms through the eyes in the manner that you mention, choosing its window as it likes, can it not then see forms not only through the eye, but also through each of the other five organs of the sense ? And, in like manner, can it not then, as well hear sounds, and experience taste, and smell odours, and feel touch, and discern conditions through each of the other five organs of sense, besides the one you have in each case specified ?

“ No, Sir. ”

(1) *Milinda* II-6 ; 35 S. B. E. III

(2) The five senses ; he omits the mind.

"Then these powers are not united one to another indiscriminately, the latter sense to the former organ, and so on. Now we, as we are seated here in the palace, with these windows all thrown open, and in full daylight, || we only, stretch forth our heads, can see all kinds of objects plainly. Can the living principle do the same when the doors of the eyes are thrown open? When the doors of the ears are thrown open, can it do so? Can it then not only hear sounds, but see sights, experience tastes, smell odours, feel touch, and discern conditions? And so with each of the windows?"

"No, Sir."

"Then these powers are not united one to another indiscriminately. Now again, great King, || Dinna here were to go outside and stand in the gate-way, would you be aware that he had done so?"

"Yes, I should know it."

"And if the same Dinna were to come back again, and stand before you, would you be aware of his having done so?"

"Yes, I should know it."

"Well, great King, would the living principle within discern, in like manner, if anything possessing flavour were laid upon the tongue, its sourness, or its saltness, or its acidity, or its pungency, or its astringency, or its sweetness?"

"Yes, it would know it."

"But when the flavour has passed into the stomach would it still discern these things?"

"Certainly not."

"Then these powers are not united one to the other indiscriminately. Now suppose, O King, a man were to have a hundred vessels of honey brought and poured into one trough, and then, having had his mouth closed over and tied up, were to have him cast into the trough full of honey. Would he know whether that into which he had been thrown was sweet, or whether it was not?"

"No Sir."

"But why not?"

"Because the honey could not get into his mouth?"

"Then, great King, these powers are not united one to another indiscriminately.⁽¹⁾"

That is, "your living principle within" cannot make use of whichever windows it pleases. And the simile of the man inside the house does not hold good. In another place, he gives the instance of a man who loads his bullocks with salt. But how does he know that it is salt. He sees and finds it white, tastes and finds it salty, weighs and finds it heavy. He then infers that it is salt. But if the soul were the man looking out of the five windows of his house he would see salt and need not go to the trouble of seeing and tasting and weighing it.⁽²⁾

Then he turns to the body; and points out that it is nothing more than an inference from certain sensations. A man's hair, nails, teeth, skin or flesh, or the bodily form do not constitute his individuality and apart from the sensations of these, there is nothing else known. What is then, Nagasen? "A mere word, Sire, is Nagasen. What is Nagasen, then? thou speakest false then, Sire, and thou liest, there is no Nagasen."

From Nagasen's point of view, and it is this view of the Orthodox Buddhist, all objects can only be known by their sensations. These sensations vary, are impermanent and independent of one another. There is no ruling and controlling master over them. There is, therefore, no such thing as "I" or "You." They are mere words. There is as much reality in the body as in the "Soul." It cannot be grasped at all by cognition, that especially it cannot consist in thought, be of the nature of cognition since all cognition is conditioned by the organs of cognition.

As Buddhaghosh put it "Any thing whatever within called Soul⁽³⁾ who sees, who moves the limbs etc., there is not"⁽⁴⁾ Before him the *Pitakas* had said the same thing: "It is not a fit question to ask: who experiences contact? Who is it that feels? This is the right way to question: *conditioned* by what, is there contact? *conditioned* by what, is there feeling?"⁽⁵⁾

(1) *Milinda* II—3-16: 35 S. B. E. 93.

(2) *Ib.* II-3-16, 35 S. B. E. 93.

(3) Pail—"Atta" = "the soul."

(4) *Sumangal-Vilarini*, 1-195.

(5) *Samgutta Nikay* 11-13.

This was explained by Nagasen to King Milinda in a more popular way.

The King,—“Does thought perception arise wherever sight arises?”

Nagsen,—“Yes, O King where the one is, there is the other.”

K.—“And which of the two arises first?”

N.—“First sight, then thought.”

K.—“Then does the sight issue, as it were, a command to thought, saying: ‘Do you spring up there where I have,’ or does thought issue command to sight, saying: ‘Where you sprung up there will I’?”

N.—“It is not so, great King, there is no intercourse between the one and the other.”

K.—“Then how is it, Sir, that thought arises wherever sight does?”

N.—“Because of there being a sloping down, and because of there being a door, and because of there being a habit, and because of there being an association.”

K.—“How is that? Give an illustration of mind arising where sight arises, because of there being a sloping down.”

N.—“Now what do you think, great King, when it rains, where will the water go to?”

K.—“It will follow the slope of the ground.”

N.—“And if it were to rain again, where would the water go to?”

K.—“It would go the same way as the first water had gone.”

N.—“What then? Does the first water issue, as it were, command to the second, saying: ‘Do you go where I have,’ or does the second issue command to the first, saying: ‘Whithersoever you go, thither will I’?”

K.—“It ■ not so, Sir. There is no intercourse between the two. Each goes its way because of the slope of the ground.”

N.—“Just so, great King, is it by reason of the natural slope that where sight has arisen there also does thought arise. And neither does the sight perception, issue command to the mind perception saying: ‘Where I have arisen, there do you also spring up,’ nor does the mind perception inform the sight perception, saying: ‘Where thou hast arisen there will I also spring up.’ There is no conversation, as it were, between them. All that happens, happens through natural slope.”⁽¹⁾

It will be observed that while Buddha was preaching this doctrine of the unreality of “soul” and “self” “ego” and “non-ego” to his disciples in India, his contemporary, Heraclitus, nicknamed “the Dark” by his successors already referred to in a preceding chapter, was expounding the same doctrine in Greece. And curiously, both Buddha and Heraclitus illustrate their common view-point by having recourse to the same illustration. For, as Buddha had pointed out that ■ river retains its nominal identity, though in no two moments is its water the same, so does Heraclitus “Into the same river we go down and we do not go down. For, into the same river no man can enter twice; ever it disperses itself and collects itself again, or rather, at once it flows in, and flows out.” The eyes and ears delude one into a show of permanence, where there is only uninterrupted change.

Now assume that we have reached the stage of consciousness. We have next to examine it at its two extreme ends—its beginning and its end—At the one end stood his doctrine of *Karm*, at the other *Nirvan*. An inquiry into the doctrine of *Karm* is a part of the Law of causality. The law of causality inquires into the causes of this great cluster of phenomena we call life, of this great congerie of worlds, we call the universe. We have sensations, that we know. But how are these sensations produced? And where do they come from and whither do they go?

⁽¹⁾ *Milinda* II-3-7; 35 S. B. E. 89, 90.

How does this great machine of the universe and of man, work ? Is it an ante-notion or is there some one behind to control it ? Does it move by chance or follow any process of cause and effect. That is the next question. And this is the great solution, "He who describes origin by way of cause, he discerns the Dhamm, he discerns origin by way of cause."⁽¹⁾

Now when Buddha examined this question of causation of things there were several theories in the field which he had adverted to and combated. There was first the school of Ajivaks, founded by Makkhali Goshal, whose view of the universe and all it holds was that it was "a jumble of things, a fortuitous concourse of atoms," working on no plan, following no system, and tending to no definable end. "Beings become depraved without cause or condition; they become morally pure also without cause. Our attainments do not depend on effort or action, either of our own or of others. There is no human energy or power that is effective. All things that have life, creatures and souls, are without inherent force. They are bent this way and that by the necessity of their specific nature." This is the doctrine of the slope by which Nagsen explained the course of thought. This is akin to the Nihilism of Ajit, founder of the Hair-garment school who denied that saints could probe any further than sinners into the mysteries of life, which began when it began and will end when it does. There never was a past life and there never can be a future life; and the good and evil deeds of this life are neither the result of the one nor can influence the other.

Buddha took the middle path and while he could not say with Ajivak that human conduct has no effect upon our lives nor could he support the abject Nihilism of Ajit of whom he said : "Just as, Bhikkhus, of all kinds of woven robes, a hair garment is least desirable, cold in cold weather, hot in the heat, unpleasant to the touch, so of all the many assertions by recluses, the Makkhali theory is the most undesirable. He, foolish man, believes and declares there ■ no effective action

(1) *Majjhima-Nikay*, I—191; *Digha*, II—275.

(going on), no resultant action (the result of effective action), no indwelling energy. Herein he rejects that which all past Buddhs have declared, all future Buddhs will declare, and which I now the Buddh declare, I, even I declare that there is effective action, resul-tant action, in-dwelling energy"(1).

But Buddh thought that an inquiry into it would take us back too far. So when Malunk asked him whether the existence of the world is eternal or non-eternal, he made him no reply; because he held it to be an inquiry that tended to no profit,(2) and when a Jain Bhikkhu questioned him, he gave a similar reply: "Put aside these questions of the beginning and the hereafter. I will teach you the Dhamm—that being present, this becomes; from the arising of that, this arises. That being absent, this does not become; from the cessation of that, this ceases "(3). In short he was then concerned with the immediate cause and not the final cause, and its system and method: "And what house-father, is this Aryan(4) method, of which one who is fit to attain the highest had by insight well seen and well penetrated?"

"This: that the Aryan disciple well and thoroughly attends to the law of causation, namely: "That being present, this becomes; because that arises, this arises etc."(5)

So far the Buddhist logic is flawless and perfect and cannot be improved upon. But the moment he goes into the causality of life, bearing in mind its uncertainties, and inequalities, also the fact that the wise suffer while the wicked ones prosper, he jumps to the conclusion that it is all *Karm* or Fate, or the effect of previous actions. And by one stroke, he decides both the past and the future of human actions. It should also be noted that in his analysis of the human mind, Buddh was dealing with a problem of his ratiocination and is, therefore, strictly logical. He correctly applies that method so far as it took him to the door of causation. He then immediately converts his psychological problem into an ethical one, and

(1) *Anguttara Nikay*, I-286

(2) Hardy—*Manual of Buddhism*, 376.

(3) *Majjhima Nikay Sutta* 79.

(4) "Aryan." "good", "true" used by

the Aryans in the same sense as Christians use "christian" for truthfulness.

(5) *Samyutta Nikay*, V. 388.

his inquiry into the cause, instead of being reasoned out, ■ at once stated in the form of a dogma—a dogma of which he was not the author, but which he had borrowed from the Brahmanical philosophy. And as he is dogmatic in his assertion of cause, he is equally dogmatic in his assertion of its effect, immediate and final. The fact is that at this stage he had abandoned his logic and closed the eye of reason which he exhorted his disciples to keep ever open.

And what is the chain of causes ? It is his wheel of law and is thus stated :—

Previous Birth.

- (1) From ignorance comes action.
- (2) From action, consciousness.
- (3) From consciousness, re-birth.

Present Life.

- (4) From that new consciousness, name and (corporeal) form.
- (5) From name and (corporeal) form, the six fields, *i.e.*, the fields of sensation (*i.e.*, the six senses including the mind and their objects).
- (6) From the six fields, the contact.
- (7) From contact, sensation.
- (8) From sensation, desire (*lit. Trishna*—Thirst.)
- (9) From desire, clinging to existence (*Upādan*).
- (10) From clinging to existence, being (*Bhav* “to be”).

Future Life.

- (11) From being, re-birth.
- (12) From re-birth, old age and death, pain, and lamentation, suffering, anxiety and suffering.

This is then his catena of causes. Now let us understand the root cause,—Ignorance. What does it mean ? It is explained by Buddh to mean ignorance of the four sacred truths. These are explained by Sariputra as follows :—“ Not to know suffering, friend, not to know the origin of suffering, not to know

the extinction of suffering: this, O friend, is called Ignorance..... Not seeing the four sacred truths as they are, I have wandered on the long path from one birth to another, now have I seen them: the current of being is stemmed. This root of suffering is destroyed there is henceforward no re-birth"⁽¹⁾ Ignorance being then the compendious expression for ignorance of suffering and its fourfold aspects, it begets action. What is action then? It is explained by Buddha himself in the following words: "In this monk, O disciples, who thus guards himself and rules his consciousness, who is immovably intent thereon in holy effort and is steadfast in self-culture, there arises a sensation of pleasure. Then he knows as follows: 'In me has arisen this pleasurable sensation, this has arisen from a cause, not without a cause. Where lies this cause? It lies in this body of mine. But this body of mine is impermanent, has become (or been formed), been produced by causes. A pleasurable sensation, the cause of which lies in the impermanent, originated, cause-produced body, how can it be permanent?' Thus as well with regard to the body as to the pleasurable sensation, he commits himself to the contemplation of impermanence, transitoriness, evanescence, renunciation, cessation, resignation. While he commits himself to the contemplation of impermanence etc., as well with regard to the body as to the pleasurable sensation, he desists from all yearning or propensity based on the body and on pleasurable sensation."

And then again "my action is my possession, my action is my inheritance, my action is the womb which bears me. My action is the race to which I am akin, my action is my refuge."⁽²⁾ What appears to a man to be his body is in truth 'the actions of his past state, which then assuming a form realized through his endeavour, has become endowed with a tangible existence.' "⁽³⁾

Now as ignorance has a moral side so has action. It becomes clear from the following explanation: "It happens, my disciples, that a monk, endowed with faith, endowed

(1) *M.V.* VI—20.

(2) *Anguttara Nikaya*.

(3) *Samyutta Nikaya* I. for "The."

with righteousness, endowed with resignation, with wisdom, communes thus with himself: 'Now then, could I, when my body is dissolved in death, obtain re-birth in a powerful princely family.' He thinks this thought, dwells on this thought, cherishes this thought. These actions (*Sankhars*) and internal conditions (*Vihars*), which he has thus cherished within him and fostered, lead to his re-birth in such an existence. This, disciples, is the avenue, this the path, which leads to re-birth in such an existence."⁽¹⁾ Actions are, therefore, our masters, and they are controlled by desires. If a person reflects a sinless state of deliverance in action and in knowledge even in this present life, he will "by the destruction of sinful existence," discover and behold for himself the sinless state of deliverance in action and in knowledge even in this present life, and will find in it his abode. Such a person will never be re-born."

We have, then, here the sum-total of the Buddhist law of causation. A man is born as a result of his past actions. If these actions are good and virtuous, the same law of causation which gave him birth, will prevent his re-birth. If, however, his actions are not virtuous, he will be subject to re-birth, assuming the higher or lower form of life according to his actions. This is the wheel of law: "The chain or wheel of the twelve bases" and the law of *Karm*.

One criticism this doctrine lends itself to, is that it postulates the continuity of self,—the identity of that consciousness which, for convenience, the Buddhist designates the "Ego." Another thing is that the four Noble Truths only take note of human suffering and assume that life is a suffering and nothing else; and that all good men wish that they were never born. Buddha would, of course, say all good men do so wish and those who don't are not good men. They are rooted to ignorance, because they have still to realize the four sacred truths. It is just here where logic fails and religion begins.

(1) *Sankharuppati Sutta*.

The Buddhists deduce three stages from their "Twelve Bases" categorized above. The first two relate to the past life. A man's ignorance in that life caused action and action, conception and consciousness; then follow the eight stages of the present life; while the last two refer to the future re-birth. The distinction is surely artificial, and the several heads might easily be reduced. But they are the recognized "Twelve Bases of the wheel or chain," of the Buddhist *Dhamm* and are the corner-stone of their creed,—second only in importance and sacredness to the four sacred truths already set out.

We have so far dealt with consciousness, its root and subsidiary causes. We have next to turn to the doctrine of re-births and Nirvan and the path leading up to them, which occupy ■ large a space in the canonical law ■ to deserve a separate chapter.

CHAPTER XIII

THE PATH TO NIRVAN.

I

What is Nirvan ?

From the foregoing discussion, it is clear that all the ills of life—past, present and future are due to one supreme cause ;—ignorance of the four sacred Truths and that if one could master them, then life should be free from the further perils of re-birth ; and the self of man would obtain eternal repose in Nirvan—which is the final goal of existence and which all beings should strive for.

This raises the question—what is Nirvan and how to attain it ? As out of the two, one is more interested in the prize before he sets about trying to win it, it is just as well to inquire here the nature and description of Nirvan for which Buddhism calls for a life-long sacrifice. Nirvan is a Sanskrit word, and means “extinguished,” as a lamp or fire. In the Mahabharat it is used to denote the liberation of the soul from the body and its re-union with the Supreme Spirit.⁽¹⁾ Both in the Kiratarjuniya⁽²⁾ and in the Raghuvansh⁽³⁾ it is used to connote annihilation, or total extinction of individual or worldly existence, but as also implying the continuity of consciousness accompanied by perpetual calm, repose, satisfaction or pleasure, as implying the highest felicity and supreme bliss.

In the *Dhammapad* it is used in at least three senses—(a) as descriptive of a mental state even in this life ; (b) as the state of immortality after this life ; and (c) as a place which is no other than Heaven. That it is something distinct from heaven is indicated in the *Dhammapad* where it is said : “Some people are born again ; evil-doers go to hell ; righteous

(1) *Mahabharat*, 2.

(2) *Kiratarjuniya*, 11-69 ; 18-39.

(3) *Raghuvansh*, XII-1-5.

people go to heaven; those who are free from all worldly desires attain Nirvan.”⁽¹⁾ Now Nirvan is not a place for the repose of souls like a paradise. It is not a heaven for the enjoyment of eternal bliss, it is not even a mental state attainable after death, since Nirvan may be attained equally by a person in this life. “Hunger is the worst of diseases; the elements of the body, the greatest evil; if one knows this truly, that is Nirvan, the highest happiness.”⁽²⁾ “Health is the greatest of gifts, contentedness, the best riches; trust is the best of relationship, Nirvan the highest happiness.”⁽³⁾ But in the very same suttra we find the term used in a different sense as descriptive of immortality and a heaven. “As soon as he (the Bhikkhu) has considered the origin and destruction of elements (*khandas*) of the body, he finds happiness and joy which belongs to those who know the immortal (Nirvan).”⁽⁴⁾ Then again: “The sages who injure nobody, and who always control their body, they will go to the unchangeable place (Nirvan), where, if they have gone, they will suffer no more.”⁽⁵⁾ “A wise and well-behaved man who knows the meaning of this, should quickly clear the way that leads to Nirvan.”⁽⁶⁾ “The Bhikkhu who believes with kindness, who is happy in the doctrine of Buddha, will reach the quiet place (Nirvan), happiness arising from the cessation of natural inclinations.”⁽⁷⁾ “The Bhikkhu full of delight, who is happy in the doctrine of Buddha will reach the quiet place (Nirvan), happiness consisting in the cessation of natural inclinations.”⁽⁸⁾

It appears that the Buddhist theory of Nirvan has passed through several stages of evolution, though it is by no means clear whether annihilation preceded the supreme bliss or the latter preceded the former. Professor Max Muller upholds the latter view,⁽⁹⁾ but others including Dr. Oldenberg maintain the former.⁽¹⁰⁾ It appears that in the earliest teachings, of which records are available, Buddha implied, if he did not

(1) *Dhammapad*, IX-126; 10 S.B.E. 35.

(2) *Ib.* XV-203; 10 S.B.E. 55.

(3) *Ib.* XV-204; 10 S.B.E. 56.

(4) *Ib.* XXV-374; 10 S.B.E. 88.

(5) *Ib.* XVII-225; 10 S.B.E. 50.

(6) *Ib.* XX-289; 10 S.B.E. 70.

(7) *Dhammapad* XXV-368; 10 S.B.E. 87.

(8) *Ib.* XXV-381; 10 S.B.E. 89.

(9) *Intro.* Roger's *Buddhaghosh—Parables XXXIX seq.*

(10) *Buddhism* 267-272.

express it, that it was the final extinction of life without residuum which could not sprout into a new life. "The body of the Perfect One, O disciples, is cut off from the stream of becoming. As long as his body subsists, so long will gods and men see him ; if his body be dissolved, his life runs out, gods and men shall no more behold him." (1) "Dissolved is the body, extinct is perception ; the sensations have all vanished away. The actions have found their repose : the consciousness has sunk to its rest." (2) "Where there is heat, coolness is also found, so also where there is the three-fold fire—the fire of love, hate and infatuation—the extinction of the fire (Nirvan) must be sought". (3) And there are other passages which throw no clear light on the subject. Some of them are clearly poetical ;—as for instance, his sermon at Gaya where he speaks : "Everything, O Bhikkhus, is in flames. And what is in flames ? Everything, with the fire of lust, of ignorance, with the anxieties of birth, decay, death, grief, lamentation, suffering, dejection, and despair....Becoming weary of all that, he divests himself of passion ; by the absence of passion he is made free ; when he is free, he becomes aware that he is free ; and he realizes that re-birth is exhausted ; that holiness is completed ; that duty is fulfilled ; and that there is no further return to this world." (4) This is Nirvan in the first sense ; and there are passages which support it in the second sense. But these and such passages do not go far enough to describe the state, or condition or place to which the Buddhist looks forward to as his ultimate goal.

This ambiguity continues to pervade the doctrine even upto the age of King Menander (reigned 140—115, 110 B.C.) whose questions on the subject elicited from the sage Nagsen replies which may now be examined. Being questioned about Nirvan he says in one place that it was a condition of the mind and he explains : "Nirvan exists, O King. And it is perceptible to the mind. By means of his pure heart, refined and straight, free from obstacles, free from low cravings,

(1) *Bhamañjal Sutta* (end) cited per Oldenberg *Buddhism* 266.

(2) *Udan*.

(3) *Buddhism* ; cf. *M.V.* 1.21-24 ; S.B.E. 134, 135.

(4) *M. V.* 1.21-2-4 ; 13 S.B.E. 134, 135.

that disciple of the Noble One, who has fully attained, can see Nirvan."

K. "Then what Sir, is Nirvan? Such a Nirvan (I mean) as can be explained by similies. Convince me by argument how far the fact of its existence can be explained by similies?"

N. "Is there such a thing, O King, as wind?"

K. "Yes, of course."

N. "Show it to me then, I pray you, O King, whether by its colour, or its form, whether as thin or thick, or short or long!"

K. "But wind, Nagsen, cannot be pointed out in that way. It is not of such a nature that it can be taken into the hand or squeezed. But it exists all the same."

N. "If you can't show me the wind, then there can't be such a thing."

K. "But I know there is, Nagsen. That wind exists, I am convinced, though I cannot show it to you."

N. "Well, just so, O King, does Nirvan exist, though it cannot be shown to you in colour or in form."

K. "Very good, Nagsen! This is so, and I accept it as you say. (1)"

According to Nagsen, Nirvan is only a state of the mind; and as he later pointed out, it is all bliss, and there is no intermingling of pain in it. (2) It is the dawn of a higher wisdom when man sees truly the vanity of life and all things in it. It is that mental state of composure, when having realized the true state of the worldly apperceptions, the mind feels an inward glow in its own light which has come from the dispelling of ignorance. "Those who are in quest of Nirvan, afflict their minds and bodies, it is true, restrain themselves in standing, walking, sitting, lying and in food,

(1) *Milinda* IV—7-17; 36 S. B. E.
106, 107.

(2) *Id.* IV—8-58; 36 S. B. E.
182-185.

suppress their sleep, keep their senses in subjection, abandon their very body and their life. But it is after they have thus, in pain, sought after Nirvan that they enjoy the Nirvan which is bliss unalloyed—as teachers do, the bliss of knowledge. Thus ■ it, O King, that Nirvan is all bliss; and there is no pain mingled with it. For Nirvan is one thing, and the pain another.” (1)

“And if you ask—‘How Nirvan is to be known?’—it is by freedom from distress and danger, by confidence, by peace, by calm, by bliss, by happiness, by delicacy, by purity, by freshness.” (2) But as he proceeds, Nagsen converts the present mental bliss into a mental bliss after death, for he says: “Just, O King, as a man, who, venturing into a strange land, has lost his way, on becoming aware of a path, free from jungle, that will lead him home, bounds forward along it, contented in mind, exulting and rejoicing at the thought: ‘I have found the way at last!’—just so in him who perceives the insecurity of transitory births, there arises the thought: ‘All on fire is this endless becoming, burning, and blazing! Full of pain is it, and despair!’ If only one could reach a state in which there were no becoming, there would then be calm, that would be sweet, the getting rid of all these defects, the end of cravings, the absence of passion, peace, Nirvan! And therewith does his mind leap forward into that state in which there is no becoming, and then has he found peace, then does he exult and rejoice at the thought: ‘A refuge have I found at last!’ And he strives with might and main along that path, searches it out, accustoms himself thoroughly to it, to that end does he make firm his self-possession, to that end does he hold fast in effort, to that end does he remain steadfast in love (towards all beings in all the worlds), and still to that does he direct his mind again and again, until gone far beyond the transitory, he gains the Real, the highest fruit (of Arhatship). And when he has gained that, O King, the man who has ordered his life aright has realised (seen face to face) Nirvan.” (3)

(1) *Milinda*, IV—8—185.

(2) *Milinda* IV—8—196.

(3) *Milinda*—IV—31—200, 201.

This disquisition makes confusion a little worse confounded. Hitherto Nagſen was clear—at any rate, on one point, namely, that Nirvan was a state of mental beatitude, arising from knowledge. But now the circle of Nirvan is widened even to the state after life;—which raises the question once more—what is the Buddhistic conception of future life and what place has Nirvan in it?

These questions were put to Nagſen by the King, though, unfortunately, unconnected with the question of Nirvan. The King asked, "Nagſen, is there any one who after death is not re-individualised?"

N. 'Some are so, and some not.

K. 'Who are they?'

N. 'A sinful being is re-individualised, a sinless one is not.'

K. 'Will you be re-individualised?'

N. 'If when I die, I die with craving for existence in my heart, yes; but if not, no.' (1)

But would there be the continuity of consciousness, the preservation of the individuality, the survival of the ego? According to Nagſen, yes, but with this difference that the consciousness in the two egos would vary. "It is like milk, which when once taken from the cow turns after a lapse of time, first to curds, and then from curds to butter, and then from butter to ghee. (2) Now would it be right to say that the milk was the same thing as the curds, or the butter, or the ghee?"

"Certainly not; but they are produced out of it."

"Just so, O King, is the continuity of a person or thing maintained—one comes into being, another passes away; and the re-birth is, as it were, simultaneous. Thus neither as the same nor as another, does a man go on to the last place of his self-consciousness." (3)

(1) *Milinda* II-6; 35 S.B.E. 50;
Milinda, II-2-7; 35 S.B.E. 70.

(2) "clarified butter."
(3) *Milinda* II-2-2; 35 S.B.E. 64, 65.

This he explains in answer to a further question :

K. "When you speak of transmigration, Nagsen, what does that mean ?

N. "A being born here, O King, dies here. Having died here, it springs up elsewhere. Having been born there, then it dies. Having died there, it springs up elsewhere. That ■ meant by transmigration".

K. "Give me an illustration."

N. "It is like the case of a man who after eating a mango, should set the seed in the ground. From that a great tree would be produced and give fruit. And there would be no end to the succession, in that way, of mango trees" (¹).

The cessation of these re-births is Nirvan. This was the answer to another.

"The king said : 'Is cessation Nirvan ?'

"Yes, your Majesty."

Being asked to explain how, he gives the same explanation he had given before, namely, that re-birth ceases, if there is no craving for re-birth (²). But the king might have added : What does a man care, if he is re-born or not, so long as he is not conscious of it, and since consciousness is the sole *nexus* between his present self and his future re-incarnation, what does it matter to him what and where he is born ?

This is an aspect of the question which did not trouble Nagsen or his royal questioner.

He was, however, certain that Nirvan itself is free from the law of Karm, though its author is a sport of it. "All beings, O King, who are conscious, are Karm-born, spring into existence as the result of Karm, Fire, and all things growing out of seeds, are cause-born (the result of a pre-existing material cause). The earth, and the hells, water and wind—all these are season-born (depend for their existence on seasons connected with weather). Space and Nirvan exist independently alike ■ Karm

(¹) *Milinda* II-6-9 ; 35 S.B.E. 120.

(²) *Ib.* II-4-6 ; 35 S.B.E. 106, 107.

and cause, and seasons. Of Nirvan, O King, it cannot be said that it is Karm-born, or has not been, or can be produced, that it is past or future or present, that it is perceptible by the eye or the nose or the ear or the tongue or by the sense of touch. But it is perceptible, O King, by the mind. By means of his pure heart, refined and straight, free from the obstacles, free from low cravings, that disciple of the Noble One who has fully attained can see Nirvan." (1)

So far then, we have made very little progress in our inquiry. We have only learnt that Nirvan is a state of mental beatitude arising out of knowledge. As such, it is an individual state of the mind, and not a receptacle for all such minds. Whatever consciousness goes to establish a man's identity is wholly lost by his death, though the effect of his conscious life somehow out-lives him and it is that inscrutable residuum which, following the remorseless law of Karm, either comes to rest in a Nirvan,—an eternal beatitude, or breaks forth into a new life with its perennial suffering and death.

But as previously suggested, this was the nebulous state of the doctrine, the centre and circumference of which were neither measured nor defined. It was the adoption of the Brahmanic doctrine of Nirvan with its central figure left out. But the leaving out of Brahm created difficulties and while it was easy to conceive of a blessed soul merging its consciousness, perhaps an *imperium in imperio* therein—as a link of its past self, it became difficult to define a mental blessedness with reference to past and future lives. Not only the absence of a central unifying spirit, but the absence of a local habitation detracted from the realization of an abstruse concept, the difficulty of which was not reduced by the elimination of even the Soul from the body of the doctrine.

It was the one drawback of the doctrine which in order to be more popular had to be further materialized; and as will be seen from what has passed before, the Mahayan school had to convert Nirvan into a pleasant paradise, where the

(1) *Milinda* IV-7-18; 36 S.B.E. 107, 108.

souls of the emancipated Bhikkhus and lay saints would revel in the reflection of their past lives and enjoy in comparison the beatitude and peace of their self-earned immortality.

To complete the picture, not only the soul was replaced but also personal God and with him a batallion of lesser gods, and all the paraphernalia of demi-gods, saints and those who had earned their right to Nirvan, but were still lingering in the earthly region. At what stage, these changes came about—we know not, as we have nothing to fix the chronological sequence of Buddhist thought or events; and it is a serious draw back, though inevitable. But nevertheless we have this fact to remember that Nirvan, whatever it may have been, whatever it may have become and whatever it may be—was at no time annihilation or nothingness, since annihilation is inconsistent with consciousness and Nirvan was the very essence of higher consciousness. At some stage, it became not a state but a place and that place is none other than paradise. Two *Suttras* deal with it. They are the larger and smaller *Sukhvasi Vyuha* which are the religious scriptures of the Mahayan school dominating China and Japan, in which latter country these two *Suttras* possess special authority. They both describe the land of bliss to which the devout and virtuous go; that destination according to the larger, being determined by merit, according to the smaller by devotion. These are amongst the discourses of Buddha, alleged to have been delivered in the last year of his life to Vaiḍehi, the consort of King Bimbeshwar, who was disgusted with the wickedness of her son Ajatshatru. She approached Buddha and he instructed her into the three good actions which would entitle her to be born in the land of Bliss. These passports to heaven compromise—wordly goodness, good morality and good practice. This paradise is in charge of Amitabha Buddha and Nirvan means nothing more and nothing less than the transfer of a devotee from this earth to that one, for ever.

“After this, the blessed Anand thus spoke to the Bhagwat: ‘O Bhagwat, has that Bhikkhu Dharmakar, the noble-minded Bodhisatv, after having obtained the highest perfect knowledge, passed away, having entered Nirvan, or has he not yet

been enlightened, and does he dwell now, remain, support himself, and teach the law ?

"The Bhagwat said: 'Not indeed, O Anand, has that Tathagat passed away, nor has he not yet come, but the Tathagat, the holy, after having obtained the highest perfect knowledge, dwells now, remains, supports himself, and teaches the law, in the western quarter, in the Buddh country, distant from this world by a hundred thousand *niyuts* of Kotis of Buddh countries, in the world which is called *Sukhvati*; ⁽¹⁾ being called Amitabha—the Tathgat, holy and fully enlightened. He ■ surrounded by innumerable Bodhisatvas, and worshipped by endless Shravaks, and in possession of the endless perfection of his Buddh country." ⁽²⁾

Here then there was a defined and definite objective. Nirvan was merely the state of bliss in paradise to which the Blessed were called, on the strength of their stock of merit. This is the third view of Nirvan; and since *Sukhvati Vyuh* had been composed before 252 A.D. when according to the followers of the sect of Godoshin (the sect of "Pure land") whose chief authority that work is, its copies were taken from India to China, it may then be taken for granted that the new view must have held the field at least for many years before that date.

The denizens of this Buddhist Paradise belong to two classes. Those with full faith in their future are born to enjoy the life of Sukhvati unfettered by any restrictions; but those who have died, doubting the perfect and unfailing knowledge of Buddh, have to pass through a period of probation in the calyx of lotus, till they have amassed a stock of merit to be free to sit cross-legged in the lotus-flowers. ⁽³⁾

In another Sutra it is said: "He who has entered on the path of the Bodhisatvas should thus frame his thought: All beings must be delivered by me in the perfect world of

(1) *Sukhvati* "Sukh"—pleasure, "vat"—giver of. "The land of bliss."

(2) *Sukhvati* 11; 49 S.B.E. 27, 28.

(3) *Sukhvati* 41; 49 S.B.E. 62, 63.

Nirvan, and yet after I have thus delivered these beings, no being has been delivered". (1)

The state of immortality otherwise than in the local paradise of the Buddha is nowhere contemplated. From the foregoing, it seems clear that the Buddhist Nirvan is neither extinction nor annihilation, nor the state of spiritual beatitude in this life, but that which is attainable after death as a result of the accumulation of a sufficient stock of merit, such stock of merit being only that preached by Buddha and no other. (2)

A close study of the *Sutras* and the Buddhist scriptures generally and remembering the class of persons to whom they were addressed and who flocked to receive the new dispensation, a suggestion forces itself upon one that the two aspects of the salvation adumbrated in them may not necessarily have been divided by distance of time, and it may be that the great Teacher had always kept in view the dual aspects of his doctrine which may have formed a part of his esoteric and exoteric teachings respectively. That he could not have addressed the same words to his audience of varying mental calibre seems beyond question. Nor would his creed have been the astounding success it was, if he had offered his disciples in the outer temple the poor consolation of ending in nothing. The idea is too revolting to the human mind, even to those who though nurtured in the lap of modern science, yet hug to their bosom a belief that somehow man's personality must survive the ravages of time. To Buddha, who had consecrated his life for the alleviation of human suffering, virtue was doubtless its own reward, and it is all that his Nirvan as producing mental bliss means and could have conveyed to the adept disciples. But to the generality of his followers the bait had to be a more attractive one, not necessarily that which the Mahayan school afterwards offered, but its germ lay in the human aspiration for a longer and better life free from the troubles and turmoil of this life, in a life beyond.

(1) *Vajrachhedik* ("The diamond-cutter"). (2) *Ib.* 8 S.B.E. 119.

One need scarcely suggest that those who took the vow must not have, if they gave the least reflection to the life they were living and the sacrifices they were to make, been drawn to the new faith without being assured of at least the hope of a better life. One of his Bhikkhus wished to put the bald doctrine of his creed to the test by suggesting suicide as the best means of shortening the sufferings. But Buddha was the first to reprimand him for his folly. This is what he said, "A brother is not, O Bhikkhus, to commit suicide, whosoever does so shall be dealt with according to the law."⁽¹⁾ Then asked Milinda of the sage Nagsen, "How do you reconcile this with the view that life is a suffering?" "On this ground," replied the sage: "that future births depend upon the man's actions in this; and those must be for the good of mankind."

Another crucial test was offered in the suggestion that if life is a suffering, why should not inaction mitigate it. But he was equally against inaction. "Rise! sit up, what is the use of your sleeping; to those who are sick, pierced by the sorrow (of pain) and suffering, what sleep is there?"⁽²⁾

To him the ideal life was the life of human service, of service to all sentient beings, his cosmopolitan sympathies, his abounding love for those who had fallen, and those who became sub-merged in the social order—this is proved by the fact that he chose for his disciple his own barber, enlisted in his Order fallen women, dined with them openly, refusing the more sumptuous hospitality of the head of the powerful Licchavi rulers. And never in his life did he preach or practise a creed which did not make human service the be-all and the end-all of his earthly existence. Such exalted altruism could not have been forced upon a clan or a people who had little previous preparation to appreciate or accept the policy of self-effacement and abnegation of the ordinary amenities of life. One has merely to imagine the soil in which the seed was laid, the hostile elements by which it was surrounded, to conclude that the Nirvan he had foreshadowed could never have been an

(1) *Milinda*, 14-13; 35 S.B.E. 273-278

Kulvagg, 10-1; 10 S.B.E. 54.

absorption into Nothing, an annihilation of all-gathering hopes, with the only prospect held out that when the grave closed over the sufferer it closed his life-story for ever, and there was nothing left to gain, because there was nothing left to preserve. Such was indeed the doctrine of Ajit, the hair-attired ascetic, whom he heartily denounced. He could never have told his Bhikkhus that what he was offering was the same thing in another guise. Nor was he enamoured of the Sankhya doctrine. He had early in his career met its doctors and found them wanting. His was a creed which revolted against inaction. His was a mission of human service. His was the ideal of the Great Renunciation. Was it ever possible without a return? He had striven for and succeeded in moving the masses to accept his Gospel.

If the destiny to which he drew his adherents was no better than that in Hinduism, it would have sufficed to kill his movement at its very inception. His Nirvan must then have been more attractive even to the lay mind. People do not readily forsake their selfish instincts merely to join a new cause, least of all the Indian who was till then wholly uninured to the call of social service. The Indian's creed was the creed to hie from society to the solitude of the forest or a hermitage. To him the social call had never had any meaning. Would Buddh have, even by his magnetic personality, turned the tide of human indifference to active ministering angels in other peoples' sufferings? Could he by his clarion call have made the yeoman abandon his plough, his wife and children and don the tattered rags of a life-long mendicant, without any notion of what he was doing and what his actions may bring him to? The very question seems impertinent.

Professor Max Muller seems, therefore, nearer the mark when he opines that what Buddh taught in his theory of Nirvan was not the extinction but the completion of being. It may be that the later metaphysicians have undoubtedly associated it with Nothing as its objective. But that was their conclusion, not his teaching. To him and his disciples

Nirvan was nothing more than the entry of the spirit upon its rest, an eternal beatitude, which is as highly exalted above the joys of hereafter, as it is above the joys of the transitory world. Would not, the Professor asks, a religion, which lands us at last in the Nothing, ceases, to be a religion? It would no longer be what every religion ought to be, and purports to be, —a bridge from the temporal to the eternal; but it would be a delusive gangway, which suddenly breaks off and shoots a man just when he fancies he has reached the goal of the eternal, into the abyss of annihilation. (1)

Childers takes the same view in his Pali Dictionary, (2) holding that by Nirvan is meant the condition of the perfect saint, in whom the five *khandas* are still to the fore, but the desire, which chains to being, is extinct. So Rhys Davids: "What then is Nirvan which means simply going out, extinction? (it being quite clear, from what has gone before, that this cannot be the extinction of a soul). It is the extinction of that sinful, grasping condition of mind and heart which would otherwise, according to the great mystery of Karma, be the cause of renewed individual existence. That existence is to be brought about by, and runs parallel with, the growth of the opposite condition of mind and heart, and it is complete when that opposite condition is reached. Nirvan is therefore the same thing as *sinless, calm state of mind*; and if translated all, may best perhaps be rendered 'holiness'—holiness, that is in the Buddhist sense, *perfect peace, goodness and wisdom*." (3) So Keith: "The end of the meditations of the disciple is to lead to the final intuition of the four noble truths, which brings with it the recognition that there is no chance of re-birth.

"This is the essential fact of Nirvan; the monk is freed from the intoxicants or defilements (4) of desire, of becoming, of false views, of ignorance, all appetite, all aversion, all dullness and confusion are departed; the outward form remains, it is true, while life lasts, but

(1) Intro. Roger's "Parables" XXXIX seq.
(2) *Buddhism* (Eng. Ed.) 111, 112.
(3) p.p. 267, 526.

(4) Pali—"Avas" Impurity.

the essential result is achieved, and what happens to the monk when physical death sets in, cannot alter the fact ; we can understand how the Buddha was willing to rule such questionings out as inadmissible, because he had formed a conception of the *Summum bonum* as Nirvan, which provided for its being attained in his life." (1) And it gave the person who had attained it, not only mental bliss, but a wider field of intellectual and spiritual vision. " It was, while life lasted, a state of extremely marked psychic powers, conferring on the saint powers of a varied, and to western ideas, incongruous kind. The first is the power of perceiving the inter-relation of consciousness and the body ; and this leads to the second, higher fruit of the power to create a body made by, or of mind, a conception to which we owe, it may be feared, the astral body of spiritualism and other follies. Then he enjoys magic power ; he can multiply himself and become one again ; be visible or invisible, penetrate a wall as if air, or the ground as if water ; walk on water, fly like a bird in the sky, touch sun and moon, and reach in body the heaven of Brahm." (2)

But these supernatural powers were claimed at a much later stage, and it is permissible to doubt whether they were not excrescences added on to the doctrine with the mediæval corruption of the creed.

However, it is now generally agreed that Nirvan calls for nothing more than the destruction of desire and that it is attainable even in this life. But this is its commencing stage ; does it survive death ? That it did, is supposed by numerous texts ; but it does not appear to have been a part of the original doctrine which was first conceived by what it was not. " There is, O disciples, a state where there is neither earth nor water, neither light nor air, neither infinity of space, nor infinity of reason, nor absolute void, nor the co-extinction of perception, neither this world nor that world,—both sun and moon. That, O disciples, I term neither coming, nor going, nor standing, neither death nor birth. It is without basis, without procreation, without

(1) *Buddhist Philosophy*—128.

(2) *Id.*—129.

cessation: that is the end of sorrow." (1) "There is, O disciples, an unborn, unoriginated, uncreated, unformed. Were there not, O disciples, this unborn, unoriginated, uncreated, unformed, there would be no possible exit from the world of the born, originated, created, formed." (2)

Buddh himself did not go beyond this definition. When he was questioned upon its survival after death, he did not assert or deny its existence. "By leaving the matter unexplained, the Buddh allowed men to frame their own conceptions of the future of the enlightened man after death; those who entertained strong desires for some permanent form of life, even after liberation, were as entitled to cherish the hope, as were others to accept utter annihilation as the due result, and we really have no means of saying to what proportion of the disciples, either prospect would appeal; western analogies show sufficiently that there are many earnest thinkers, who believe in the reality and purpose of the universe—which the Buddh did not—and yet accept the destruction of the individual on death with satisfaction or resignation. It has, however, been urged that we cannot suppose that so able a thinker as the Buddh, was without personal convictions on such a vital issue, even though he may have deemed on good grounds that it was neither advantageous nor necessary to explain his opinions to his disciples.

"Here again, we are confronted with bare possibilities; it is quite legitimate to hold that the Buddh was a genuine agnostic, that he had studied the various systems of ideas prevalent in his day, without deriving any greater satisfaction from them than any of us to-day do from the study of modern systems, and that he had no reasoned or other conviction on the matter." (3) One thing is certain that when his inquirers asked him the question, he did not vouchsafe anything but a non-committal reply. And his renunciation of the pantheism of the Upanishads, and his familar allusion to the flame, makes one seriously reflect whether

(1) *Udan.*
(2) *Ib.*

(3) *Buddhist Philosophy*—63.

to his own adept pupils he had not confided his view that they need not look forward to the survival of Nirvan after death. "World and the self are one; thus shall I be after the death eternal, firm, ever-lasting, not subject to change, like the ever-lasting one; thus shall I stay, is not that, O monks, a mere complete doctrine of the fools?" (1) "As the flame blown down by the vehemence of the wind goes out, and can be named no more, even so the sage, liberated from individuality, goes out and can be named no more." (2)

This view is echoed by Dr. Oldenberg, who, on the authority of the earlier texts, holds that Buddh meant by Nirvan nothing else than annihilation, and that the gloss of eternity is a later doctrine. He argues that the fact that Buddh was ever non-committal as to the existence of the ego made it impossible for him to have prescribed for an eternity incompatible with it, and incomprehensible without it. He, therefore, opines that Buddh, at any rate, did not prescribe for any other Nirvan.

He meets Prof. Max Muller's argument as to the impossibility of such a religion by suggesting that what might appear impossible in the West is not equally impossible to the East. "In the sultry, dreamy stillness of India, thoughts spring and grow, otherwise than in the cool air of the West. Perhaps what is here beyond comprehension, may there be comprehensible, and if we reach a point which is to us a limit of comprehension, we shall permit much to pass and stand as incomprehensible, and await the future, which may bring us nearer the solution of the enigma." (3) The last explanation has already been met by what has been stated before. And as to the other objections, it is perfectly true that Buddh never committed himself to any pronouncement on the existence or non-existence of the ego; but the argument is purely metaphysical, and Buddh was not a metaphysician in the ordinary acceptation of the term, (4) but a religious teacher.

As stated before, his reasoning was mainly *a posteriori* and not *a priori*. He was convinced that life was a

(1) *Buddhist Philosophy* 66.

(2) *Suttanipata*, 1074; *Majjhima Nikaya* 16, 10 S. B. E. 166; 1; 10 S. B. E. 164.

Buddhism—268.

He despised dogmas—*Athakavagga*

suffering, and he was trying to find a cure. He was prepared to go as far as it was necessary for his purposes, but he wisely turned back at a point where he found the question had ceased to be practical. For had he not said, when asked—whether the world is everlasting or limited by bounds of time? He answered: “But when any one does not understand a matter and does not know it, then a straightforward man says:—‘I do not understand that,’ ‘I do not know that.’”⁽¹⁾ Malunkya presses the query, whereupon he tells him plainly his inability to dispel his ignorance on that point, adding that it was no drawback to accept his teaching so far as it went. “If a person struck by a poisoned arrow were to say to the physician called in, to heal his wound, ‘I shall not allow my wound to be treated until I know who the man is by whom I have been wounded, whether he is a Kshatriya, a Brahman, a Vaishya or a Shudra,’ or if he said: ‘I shall not allow my wound to be treated, until I know what they call the man, who has wounded me, and of what family he is, whether he is tall, or small, or of middle stature, and how his weapon was made, with which he struck me,’ what would the end of the case be?—The man would die of his wound. Therefore, Malunkya putta, whatever has not been revealed by me, let that remain unrevealed, and what has been revealed, let it be revealed.”⁽²⁾

In one of his discourses, while denying the existence of soul he admits the existence of mind. A General of the Army, who was by occupation a Jain, questioned him upon the doctrine of inaction which Buddha repudiated. He was satisfied, but there was an officer among the retinue, who heard of the discourse between the Blessed One and the General, and there was some doubt left in his heart.

“This man came to the Blessed One, and said: ‘It is said, O Lord, that the Shraman Gautam denies the existence of the soul. Do they, who say so, speak the truth, or do they hear false witness against the Blessed One?’

“And the Blessed One said: ‘There is a way in which those who say so, are speaking truly of me; on the other hand,

⁽¹⁾ *Kulmalunkya Ovada; Majjhima Nikaya*—1.436. ⁽²⁾ *Ib.*

there is a way in which those who say so, do not speak truly of me.'

"The Tathagat teaches that there is no self. He who says that the soul is his self, and that the self is the thinker of our thoughts and the actor of our deeds, teaches a wrong doctrine which leads to confusion and darkness.

"On the other hand, the Tathagat teaches that there is mind. He who understands by soul, mind, and says that mind exists, teaches the truth which leads to clearness and enlightenment."

The officer said: "Does then the Tathagat maintain that two things exist?—that which we perceive with our senses and that which is mental?" "Said the Blessed One: 'Verily I say unto you, your mind is mental, but that which you perceive with your senses is also mental. There is nothing within the world or without, which either is not mind or cannot become mind. There is a spirituality in all existence, and the very clay upon which we tread can be changed into children of truth.' "(1)

But this was an ambiguous reply which may or may not have satisfied the officer. To other questioners he was less committal. For instance, when the wandering monk Vachagot asked him where there was the soul (*atta*), the Blessed One was silent, and still remained silent when he repeated his question. The monk then left him, whereupon Anand asked him why he had not replied to the monk's question: He said: "If I had answered 'the ego is,' then that would have confirmed the doctrine of the Samans and Brahmans who believe in permanence.....But if I had said 'the ego is not,' then that would have equally confirmed their doctrine."

He then added "All existences are non-ego." (2) In the same *Sutra* there is another discourse on the same subject. Another monk, Yamak had asked his great disciple Sariputra the same question, upon which Sariputra drew him to a Socratic dialogue and easily nonplussed him. But he himself vouchsafed no reply: He asks his questioner:

(1) *Carue*: 11, 130, 131.

(2) *Samgutta Nikaya*—Vol. II

"How thinkest thou, friend Yamak,—is the Tathagat identical with the corporeal form ? (1) Dost thou hold this ?

"I do not, my friend".

"Is the Tathagat identical with the sensations, the perceptions, the Sanskars, the consciousness ? Dost thou hold this ? "

"I do not, my friend."

"How thinkest thou, friend Yamak, is the Perfect One comprised in the corporeal form ? (2) Dost thou hold this ? "

"I do not, my friend."

"Is the Perfect One separate from the corporeal form ? Dost thou hold this ? "

"I do not, my friend."

"How thinkest thou, friend Yamak, are the corporeal form, sensations, perceptions, Sanskars, and consciousness (in their aggregate) the Perfect One ? Dost thou hold this ? "

"I do not, my friend."

"Thus then, friend Yamak, even here in this world the Perfect One is not to be apprehended by thee in truth, hast thou, therefore, a right to speak, saying 'I understand, the doctrine taught by the Exalted One to be this, that a monk who is free from sin, when his body dissolves, is subject to annihilation, that he passes away, that he does not exist beyond death.'"

"Such, indeed, was hitherto, friend Sariputra, the heretical view which I ignorantly entertained. But now when I hear the venerable Sariputra expound the doctrine, the heretical view has lost its hold of me, and I have learned the doctrine". (3)

But what had the venerable Sariputra to teach ? And what had he taught the unsophisticated Yamak ? Nothing. The fact is Sariputra was as ignorant as Yamak and yet he

(1) i. e., Does Buddha's body represent his true ego.

(2) i. e., in the sensations, etc.

(3) i. e., Sensations, perceptions, Sanskars (action) and consciousness.

was afraid to confess it, which the venerable Khema, a female disciple of Buddh's had the frankness to confess. King Pasenadi of Koushal had met her as he was journeying between his two towns Saket and Savathi. He asked her: "Venerable Lady, does the Tathagat exist after death?"

"The Exalted One, O Great King, has not declared, the Perfect One exists after death."

"Then does the Perfect One not exist after death, venerable lady?"

"This also, O Great King, the Exalted One has not declared: "The Perfect One does not exist after death."

"Thus, venerable lady, the Perfect One does exist after death and at the same time does not exist after death?—Thus, venerable lady, the Perfect One neither exists after death, nor does he not exist?"

After some more talk, the venerable lady thus expresses her view:

"The great ocean is deep, immeasurable, unfathomable. So also, O Great King, if the existence of the Perfect One be measured by the predicates of the corporeal form; these predicates of the corporeal form are abolished in the Perfect One, their root is severed, they are hewn away like a palm-tree, and laid aside, so that they cannot germinate again in the future. Released, O Great King, is the Perfect One from this, that his being should be gauged by the measure of the corporeal world: he is deep, immeasurable, unfathomable as the great ocean. 'The Perfect One exists after death' this is not apposite; 'the Perfect One does not exist after death' this also is not apposite; 'the Perfect One at once exists and does not exist after death' this also is not apposite; 'the Perfect One neither does, nor does not exist after death'—this also is not apposite."

The text relates that the King had later on put the same question to Buddh himself and received word for word the same reply.

We now know what is Nirvan. It is a state of mental bliss, produced by the mastery of evil desires. It is attainable in this life and its good effect does not perish with death. A person who has attained Nirvan has attained the highest excellence; he becomes free from the ordeal of re-birth, but Buddha did not say what becomes of him; the reason being that he was not sure that there was a soul and without it he could not dogmatize on the future life. But at some time or other, either he or his apostles did connect Nirvan with immortality in heaven; and it became an integral part of the Buddhist doctrine. If this view was published by Buddha, it must have been to the laity; for to his inner disciples he commended the conquest of evil desires for its own sake. It was his sole objective.

Cessation from future births being then the one overwhelmingly important quality of Nirvan, that cessation was itself subject to the law of Karm which determined whether re-births shall continue or cease. But when Vacha, a wandering monk, asked Buddha what objection he had to the theory about eternal life, "Vacha" he replied "the theory that the saint exists (or does not exist and so on) after death is a jungle, a desert, a puppet-show, a writhing, an entanglement and brings with it sorrow, anger, wrangling and agony. It does not conduce to distaste for the world, to the absence of passion, to the cessation of evil, to peace, to knowledge, to perfect enlightenment, to Nirvan. Perceiving these objections I have not adopted any of these theories." "Then has Gautam any theory of his own?" "Vacha, the Tathagat has nothing to do with theories, but this is what he knows: the nature of form, how form arises, how form perishes, the nature of perception, how it arises and how it perishes. Therefore, I say that the Tathagat is emancipated, because he has completely and entirely abandoned all imaginations, agitations and false notions about the Ego and anything pertaining to the Ego."

"But," asks Vacha, "when one who has attained his emancipation of mind dies, where is he re-born?" "Vacha,

"the word re-born does not fit the case." "Then, Gautam, he is not re-born?" To say he is not 're-born' does not fit the case, nor is it any better to say that he is both re-born and not re-born, or that he is neither re-born nor not re-born."

"Really, Gautam, I am completely bewildered, and my faith in you is gone."

"Never mind your bewilderment. This doctrine is profound and difficult. Suppose there was a fire in front of you, you would see it burning and know that its burning depended on fuel. And if it went out, you would know that it had gone out. But if some one were to ask you to which quarter has it gone, East, West, North or South, what would you say?"

"The expression does not fit the case, Gautam. For the fire depended on fuel and when the fuel is gone, it is said to be extinguished, being without nourishment."

"In just the same way, all forms by which one could predicate the existence of the saint is abandoned and uprooted like a fan palm; so that it will never grow up in future. The saint who is released from what is styled form, is deep, immeasurable, hard to fathom, like the great ocean. It does not fit the case to say either that he is re-born, or not re-born." ⁽¹⁾

The three formulas—the four sacred truths, the chain of causation and the eight-fold path are a compendious expression of the entire doctrine of Buddhism, though only the first two are held to be a complete statement of the creed.

II

Karm and Reincarnation.

It has often been a wonder to European scholars how Buddha was able to reconcile his stern rationalism with his theory of transmigration. They argue that Buddha never admitted, if he did not actually deny, the existence of the soul as an individual ego. But what Buddha did deny was

(1) *Maj. Nik.*—72.

the existence of the human ego as it was understood by the Vedantist of his time and as ■ is understood by the western philosopher to-day. To him the individual ego had no meaning. To him, as to the modern thinker, the entire range of psychology was limited to the theory of the laws of the coming and going of the contents of consciousness. To them, as to him, there appeared nothing to justify a belief in the existence of the Soul as a non-spatial entity. To the western mind, the matter would rest there ; but it was not so to Buddh. He postulated the existence of an Ego and a Soul, but in an entirely different sense. To him, these terms connoted the existence of that subtle energy which permeated the Universe, and which came into and went out of the man without losing its own identity. To him, as to Schlegel, Nature was nothing less than the ladder of resurrection, which step by step leads upward—or rather is carried from the abyss of eternal death up to the apex of life.

The controlling force in this evolution is Karm, which moves the Soul forward or backward according to its action. The doctrine of Karm is a purely Hindu doctrine, though it is not without its Western supporters. "The Soul" says Hume, "if immortal, existed before our birth. What is incorruptible must be ungenerable. Metempsychosis is the only system of immortality that philosophy can hearken to." So Shelley wrote: "If there is no reason to suppose that we have existed before that period at which our existence apparently commences, then there are no grounds for supposing that we shall continue to exist after our existence has apparently closed." The doctrine of Karm finds an echo in the Jewish Kabbalah. Its Zohar or the Book of Light contains the following words: "All the souls are subject to the trials of transmigration; and men do not know which are the Most High in their regard. They do not know how many transformations and mysterious trials they must undergo."

This view was reiterated in the Book of Proverbs: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before the works of old I was set up from everlasting, or over the earth where there

were no depths. I was brought forth : when there were no foundations abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills, was I brought forth, while as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens I was there, when he set a compass upon the face of the depth, when he established the clouds above, when he strengthened the foundations of the deep, when he gave the sea his decree that the waters should not pass his commandment ; when he appointed the foundations of the earth—then I was by him, as one brought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him : and my delights were with the Son of Man⁽¹⁾.”

That a belief in the doctrine of Karm was not confined to the pre-Christ-ian divines is clear from a saying imputed to Jesus, who declared John the Baptist to be the re-incarnation of Elijah. That doctrine has often been quoted to establish the equipoise between the seeming inequalities of this life. “There is no system” wrote Disraeli, “so simple and so little repugnant to our understanding as that of metempsychosis. The pains and pleasures of this life are by this system considered as the recompense or the punishment of our actions in another state.”

What is then the law of Karm ?

Karm means “a deed”, ⁽²⁾ and the law of Karm simply means that a man’s future is determined by his deeds. If he had led a virtuous life, then he may or may not be born again. The doctrine postulates another doctrine,—namely that of transmigration or metempsychosis which means the transmission of the soul after death from one animal body to another. The doctrine of Karm and metempsychosis is essentially a Hindu doctrine, which Buddh adopted without caring to reconcile it with his own professed agnosticism as to the immortality of the soul and its final destination through successive re-incarnations into the Supreme Brahm. He had to work on these hypotheses, though individually he was not prepared to sub-

(1) *Proverbs*, VIII-22-31.

(2) —to do.

oribe to them ; because without them he could not evolve his own theory of Nirvan.

The doctrine of Karm applies to all sentient life, whether possessing a soul or not. It postulates the persistence of life which appears again and again in re-incarnated forms though transformed into new shapes and forms but nevertheless retaining its identity and individuality as modified by its " deeds." This is the general law of evolution, modified as to man in its application—by making his future destiny and life dependent upon the actions of his previous life. Now as the merit of these actions is determined by the moral law, it follows that the law of Karm is a moral doctrine, and as morality is a part of all religions, it follows that the doctrine of Karm becomes a purely religious dogma. It must not, however, be confounded with " Fate " which proceeds upon the assumption that man's life is arranged by the deity and is independent of the merits of his acts. It is an interruption to the normal law of causation ; while Karm follows that law and indeed explains it. Thus if a man be born blind or lame, it is because of his demerit in the past life, and if he is born to power and opulence he must have been a self-sacrificing hermit in his previous birth. Karm then proceeds on the theory that deeds are as indestructible as matter : in fact more so, since they regulate re-births. It is easy to see that Karm is nothing more than the law of retribution ; and it is as such that it finds a place in Buddhism, where Karm is held to control man's destiny. Karm is just and admits of no grace by way of intercession whatever a man soweth that shall he also reap.

According to the Buddhist theology, on dissolution of the constituent parts of the human body, there is always the survival of his thought, speech and action which combinedly assume the higher or the lower forms of life, according to their moral equivalence. This is the doctrine of re-incarnation.

It must not be confounded with the doctrine of incarnation ; since, while the one is the reproduction of impermanent life, the latter is the mere assumption of a form by the deity which has no moral quality. It is merely the self-investiture

by a divine person of the constituent elements of the nature of man. It is one of the two ways of effecting the union of God and man, either by bringing down God to man, or by elevating imperfect man to divinity. Re-incarnation is the intermediate stage and one preparatory to this union.

There is, of course, no rational or scientific background for either theory which can neither be proved nor disproved. And that is probably its sole merit.

We have now seen what Nirvan is. We have now to examine the path to it. That path is both tortuous and straight. The former is subject to Karm and re-incarnations. The latter takes one straight to Nirvan. Both paths are open to all men. It is only a question of effort. The one is necessarily slow and tedious, but must be availed of by those whose merit does not entitle them to the short-cut. This takes us to the question of Buddhist ethics which must be now explained.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE ONLY WAY.

Buddh has assigned his cosmogony a secondary place in his doctrine in which he regarded the practice of virtue as all in all. And Buddhism owes its ascendancy to the supreme morality of its ethics. He places in its forefront the four sacred truths, the ignorance of which is the root of all sufferings. As already stated, these four noble truths are: (1) to understand and grasp the noble truth of suffering; (2) or of the cause of suffering; (3) or of the cessation of suffering; (4) or of the path which leads to the cessation of suffering.⁽¹⁾

The "noble truth of suffering" has already been explained. It lies in a desire for action and birth. Desire arises from a consciousness of self as something individual and distinct from the rest of the universe. The first truth deals with the law of *karm*—past life and its actions, virtuous and otherwise, which persist in the present life and would be perpetuated in future lives till a stage is reached when with the sublimation of the life and its elevation to Nirvan, there is the cessation of re-births and consequent sufferings and the attainment of final salvation. These then are the first three noble truths. The suffering in the past, suffering in the present, and suffering in the future lives are ever present. The last noble truth, which provides the master-key to their cessation, is the noblest of them all. Before that truth all else is secondary. This great truth deals with the general law of deliverance. It presents to the world the highest ethical ideal yet or ever conceived by man. It is an ideal of unlimited service and self-sacrifice, the measure of which is the four degrees of sanctity obtained by an *Arya* (*Ariyo*) or "one worthy of reverence"—as distinguished from the vulgar or "*Prithvi-Jan*" that is an ordinary Buddhist who had obtained no distinction. An *Arya* is then an undergraduate who has

(1) *M.F.* VI-29.

had some preliminary training in piety and self-control. Such training comprises the suppression, to the utmost limit—consistent with life, of the channels of sense-impressions, the cultivation of the object-world, apart from sense-pleasure,—namely, in relation to ethical and intellectual interests, and the study and regulation of the subject-world, namely, the mind. The first stage is reached when the Buddhist, be he a layman or a monk—has freed himself from the first three fetters—namely, delusion of self, doubts about the doctrine, and dependence on external rites. He is then called *Sotapanna*⁽¹⁾ or one who has entered the stream or on his course of Nirvan. One who has attained to this state can only be born a god or man, but not in the four lower births, i.e., either a lower animal, a demon, a ghost or a being undergoing torments in Hell.

The second stage is attained by him as soon as he has nearly, but not quite, freed himself from the first five fetters of existence; he has just one more birth on earth. He then becomes *Sakad-Agami* (*Sakrid-Agamin*).⁽²⁾

The third stage is reached when he is wholly free from the first five fetters. He will now never be re-born here, but will be re-born in a Brahm-heaven from which he will reach Nirvan. He is then called *An-Agami* ("Not coming") or "one who will not be re-born on earth."

The fourth and last stage is that of the completely freed man, who attains Arhatship in this life, and will at death be subject to no re-birth. He is free from all the ten fetters, from all attachments to existence, whether on earth or in heaven and from all recreative act-force. He has already entered Nirvan, and while still living, he is dead to the world. He is the *Jivan-mukt*—the "emancipated living man." He is *Ashekh* ("one who has nothing to learn") and by his transcendental faculties of knowledge, his vision is expanded and he becomes possessed of the inner eye, the inner ear, know-

(1) Pali—*Sotiya*; *Shrota*—Stream or current; "*Apann*" Sanskrit "gained, required; fallen into," "one who has entered the stream."
(2) *Sakrit*.—Once; *Agamin*—one who comes; lit: one who comes (or has to come) only once (more)—on earth.

ledge of all thoughts, the recollection of previous existences, and the extraordinary powers over matter.⁽¹⁾ This state is attainable both by men and women, and every one whether he be a layman or a monk, though in practice it was the summit of spirituality which a layman experienced great difficulties in reaching. Arhats are sub-divided into three classes :—(a) one who is an Arhat pure and simple; he cannot teach others the way. He corresponds to the simple graduate in the hierarchy of Buddhism; (b) above him ranks the *Pratyek-Buddh* or solitary saint who has attained perfection as a layman; (c) while the third and the highest degree is that in which he becomes a Bodhisatv previously described. The stages of spiritual evolution of the disciple are thus graduated and well-marked, and the measure of spiritual knowledge and the all-controlling subjugation of (evil) desires are well tested by the Sangh who are the Spiritual Corporation of the Order, and supervise and control the action and progress of the neophyte from his initiation to the final goal. Over and above them all, are the Buddhs who have attained perfection in learning wisdom and piety and who have, of course, already attained Nirvan. It seems that these five classes are sometimes varied. For we find in the *Sankhya Sutra* a different classification—*Sottiya* (learned in the revelation) being “whoever after having heard and understood every Dhamm in the world, whatever is wrong and whatever is blameless, is victorious, free from doubt, liberated, free from pain in every respect, him they call a *Sottiya* (learned in the revelation).”⁽²⁾ “Whoever after having cut off passions and desires, is wise and does not (again) enter the womb, having driven away the three-fold sign, the mind (of lust) and who does not (again) enter time, him they call an *Ariya* (noble).”⁽³⁾ “He who in this world, after having attained (the highest) gain in the charans ■ skilful, has always understood the Dhamm, clings to nothing, is liberated, and for whom there are no passions, he is a ‘*charanvat*’ (endowed with observances).”⁽⁴⁾ “Whoever abstains from the action that has a painful result above

(1) Called *Riddhi* (Pali *Iddhi*).

(2) *Sabbhya Sutta* 25; 10 S. B. E. 91.

■ *Sabbhya Sutta*; 25; 10 S. B. E. 91.

■ *Ib.* 27, 10 S. B. E. 91.

and below and across and in the middle, who wanders with understanding, who has put an end to deceit, arrogance, cupidity and anger, name and form, him they call *Paribrajak* (a wandering mendicant) who has attained the highest gain."⁽¹⁾ And there were, of course, other academic and clerical distinctions such as *Kshetrajn*⁽²⁾ (conqueror of the regions),⁽³⁾ *Kushal* (happy)⁽⁴⁾, *Pandit* (wise)⁽⁵⁾ to act as incentives to higher proficiency.

To begin with, the student of the fourth noble truth has to place himself on the right path. "This, O monks, is the sacred truth of the path to the extinction of suffering; it is this sacred eight-fold path, to wit: Right Faith, Right Resolve, Right Speech, Right Action, Right Living, Right Effort, Right Thought, and Right Self-concentration. All this fabric of light rests for its foundation on three main pillars—of uprightness, self-concentration, and wisdom, which are held together by their own weight and are neither propped nor buttressed by any extraneous force or support of reward or punishments,⁽⁶⁾ Buddh believed in self-help, and his system is essentially self-supporting: "He who speaks or acts with impure thoughts, him sorrow follows, as the wheel follows the foot of the draught-horse. He who speaks or acts with pure thoughts, him joy follows like his shadow, which does not leave him. All that we are, is the result of what we have thought; it is founded on our thoughts, it is made up of our thoughts. If a man speaks or acts with a pure thought, happiness follows him, like a shadow that never leaves him."⁽⁷⁾ They who know truth is truth and untruth is untruth, arrive at truth, and follow true desires. As rain breaks through an ill-thatched house, passion will break through an un-reflecting mind."⁽⁸⁾

The first lesson that the Buddhist has then to learn is to purify his mind. This view of morality presents a refreshing contrast to the Brahmanical teachings—where acts and rituals

(1) *Sabbhya Sutta*, 28; 10 S. B. E. 92.

(2) *Kshetra*—field (battle field) *Jin—to*
win.

(3) *Ib.* 16; ■ S. B. E. 89.

(4) *Ib.* 17; 10 S. B. E. 90.

(5) *Sabbhya Sutta*, 18; 10 S. B. E. 90.

■ *Sonadand Sutta*.

(7) *Dhammapad*, 1, 2; 10 S. B. E. 3, 4.

(8) *Dhammapad*, XVIII—239; 10
S. B. E. 61.

are everything and mind nothing. The ethos of Brahmanism is self-sacrifice, that of Buddhism self-mastery. The one is the outcome of self-deception, the other of self-realization. This self-discipline is not an abstract inculcation. It is illustrated by numerous stories, allegories and parables to bring home to the novice the practice and study of a chastened mind. "Step by step, moment by moment, must he, who is wise, cleanse himself from all impurity, as the goldsmith refines silver." Buddha recognizes the presence of evil, ⁽¹⁾ but whether it is inherent in human institutions or is a principle of the universe, he does not care to inquire into or waste his thoughts on. He takes it as existing, as certain as an eternal verity of life, and directs his disciples to keep it at arm's length. "Without a cause and unknown is the life of mortals in this world of troubles and grief and combined with pain." ⁽²⁾ "Knowing that this body is fragile like a jar and making his thoughts firm like a fortress, one should attack Mara ⁽³⁾ (the Tempter) with the weapon of knowledge; one should watch him, when conquered, and should never rest." ⁽⁴⁾ "Those who bridle their mind which travels far, moves about alone, is without a body, and hides in the chamber (of the heart) will be free from the bonds of Mara ("the Tempter.")" ⁽⁵⁾ "It is good to tame the mind, which is difficult to hold in and flighty, running wherever it listeth: a tamed mind brings happiness." ⁽⁶⁾ These exhortations apply equally to the clergy and the laity: "It is hard to leave the world (to become a friar), it is hard to enjoy the world; hard is the monastery, painful are the houses; painful it is to dwell with equals (to share every thing in common) and the itinerant mendicant is beset with pain. Therefore, let no man be an itinerant mendicant, and he will not be beset with pain. A man full of faith, if endowed with virtue and glory is respected, whatever place he may choose." ⁽⁷⁾ "Many men, whose shoulders are covered with

(1) "*Mar*"—"Death"; "*Mara*" Death personified. "King of Death," "King of Evil." See glossary.

(2) *Satta. Sutta*, 1; 10 S. B. E. 105.

(3) "*Mar*"—"Death" "*Mara*" Death personified. "King of death;" "King of

evil."

■ *Dhammapad*, III—40; ■ S. B. E. 14.

(5) *Ib.* III—37; 10 S. B. E. 12.

■ *Ib.* III—36; 10 S. B. E. 12.

(7) *Ib.* XXI—302, 303, 10 S. B. ■ 73

yellow gown are ill-conditioned and unrestrained; and evil-doers by their evil deeds go to hell." (1) "A ■ grass-blade, ■ badly grasped, cuts the arm, badly practised asceticism leads to hell." (2) "Like a well-guarded frontier-fort, with its forces within and without, so let a man guard himself. Not a moment should escape, for they who allow a right moment to pass, suffer pain when they are in hell." (3)

The mind being purified and trained, the next step he has to take is to practise uprightness. This 'erm is used in a special sense and defined by a series of following "don'ts," which centre round the following five main heads:—

- (1) Thou shalt not kill.
- (2) Thou shalt not commit theft.
- (3) Thou shalt not covet another man's wife.
- (4) Thou shalt not lie.
- (5) Thou shalt not drink.

These commandments are of general application (4). But in the case of monks a command of absolute chastity replaces the third commandment. The practice of social morality is the lowest rung of the ladder which the novice has to practise, and having practised, make it a habit of his life. It must feel and act unconsciously, so that the practise of these elementary virtues does not become a toil, an effort, a conscious act. "He who destroys life, who speaks untruth, who in the world takes what is not given him, who goes to another man's wife, and the man who gives himself to drinking, intoxicating liquors,—he even in this world digs up his own root." (5)

The Bhikkhus, as was to be expected, are subjected to additional restrictions. In their case, the commandments are ten and not only five. They include—

- (6) Eat no food except at stated times.
- (7) Use no wreaths, ornaments or perfume.

(1) *Dhammapad.* XXIII—307; 10 S. B. E. 75.

(2) *Ib.* XXII—311; ■ S. B. E. 75.

(3) *Ib.* XXII—315, 10 S. B. E. 76.

■ K.V.—22-25; 10 S. B. E. 64.

(5) *Ib.* XVIII—240, 247, ■ S. B. E. 62. It appears that these additional commandments were held equally applicable to all disciples K.V.—26; 10 S. ■ E. 64, 65.

- (8) Use no high or broad bed, but only a mat on the ground.
- (9) Abstain from dancing, singing, music, or worldly spectacles.
- (10) Own no gold or silver of any kind, and accept none. (1)

To these was added the following.—

- (1) Never think or say that your religion is the best. Never decry the religion of others.

But these, though obligatory, did not possess the same virtue as the removal of the ten fetters which Buddha exhorted his first 60 disciples to master.

These "Fetters" are—

- (1) Belief in the belief of a Self or Ego.
- (2) Doubt.
- (3) Ceremonial observances.
- (4) Lust or sensuality.
- (5) Anger.
- (6) Craving for life in a material form, either on earth or in heaven.
- (7) Longing for immaterial life in the higher heavens.
- (8) Pride.
- (9) Self-exaltation.
- (10) Ignorance (in the sense before described).

Of these those numbered 1, 3 and 4, are "wrong beliefs" which taken with "ditthi" or "wrong belief" constitute "Upadan" or a fetter of "clinging to existence."

But these are not all; we have the seven jewels of the law, reflexions and transcendental virtues which have to be practised by one, who aspires to the higher degrees. These seven jewels are: (1) the five contemplations or reflections;

(1) *M. V.*—I—56, cf. with these the Decalogue or the Mosaic Ten commandments. *Exodus XXXIV*—14-26.

(2) the four right exertions ; (3) the four paths to supernatural power ; (4) the five moral forces ; (5) the right use of the five organs of sense ; (6) the seven limbs of knowledge ; and (7) the eight-fold path.

The five above-mentioned reflections are : (1) on the thirty-two impurities of the body ⁽¹⁾ ; (2) on the duty of displaying love towards all beings ; (3) on compassion for all who suffer ; (4) on rejoicing with all who rejoice ; (5) on absolute indifference or sorrow (6) These contemplations (*Bhavanas*) take the place of prayer ; and though only six, count as the "Seven jewels" (*Sati Pathan*). They must not be confounded with *Dhyan* or Meditation, which is the Buddhist equivalent for the Vedie *Yoge* already explained. Its practice is enjoined and is considered highly meritorious. It comprises four stages and any stage reached is sufficient to stop all re-births and translate the soul of the deceased *Dhyani* to the region of *Brahm*.

Dhyan means "attention" and as the term imports, it is an exercise in which the *Dhyani* fixes his mind upon some object to the exclusion of all others, so that his intense concentration produces in him a joy which launches him in *Nirvan*.

In the second stage the object of concentration is the self ; and in the third stage, the joy disappears but only perfect serenity remains, while in the fourth stage even serenity disappears and the *Dhyani* gets into a trance, oblivious to all sense of sound and touch, lifting his mind to a transcendental state in which the latent energy becomes released and the *Dhyani* is able to perform miracles. That state is the state of *Samadhi* in which *Dhyani*, even if buried alive, does not die.

When by constant practice the devotee has brought all his senses under his perfect control, he becomes eligible for the highest prize of Arhatship and, indeed, Buddhhood. He has then practised the six (really ten) recognized virtues called

(1) Cf. *Vijai Sutta*, 10 S. B. E. (Pt. 2), 32, 33 e.g., mucus, saliva, perspiration lymph, blood, bile, fat, stench and excrements.

Paramitas ("leading to the other shore"). These virtues which the Arhat as well as the Bodhisatv has to practise are :—

- (1) The generosity and charity (*Dan*) to all who ask or need, even to the length of sacrificing one's life and limb for others. This is the prime virtue.
- (2) Practice of virtue or moral conduct (*Sila*).
- (3) Patience and tolerance (*Shanti*).
- (4) Fortitude or courage (*Virya*—bravery).
- (5) Suppression of evil desires (*Nishkamya*—work or service without expecting reward).
- (6) Transcendental wisdom (*Prajna-panna*).
- (7) Truth (*Satya*).
- (8) Steadfastness (*Adhishtan*—unwavering mind).
- (9) Love and kindness (*Maitri*)
- (10) Composure (*Upeksha*).

Many of them, however, e.g., those numbered 4, 5, 7, 8 and 10 are later additions.

Lest these abstract rules should become unintelligible, a vast and varied literature gives minute details of how all these several virtues are exemplified in practice. No one knew better than Buddh that abstract aphorisms do not count for much and he had himself in his discourses and discussions emphasized the necessity of concrete examples. He only knew too well that an ounce of practice is worth more than a pound of precept. He knew that humanity at large is less moved by abstract theories than by living examples. His own life was an illustration of his precepts, which were varied and enriched by the stories of his previous births. Thus, to the devout there was set an example of what a man could do, and had in fact done, and which he could therefore do and strive to achieve. These stories known as the *Jataks* are all fables put into the mouth of Buddh who is said to have recounted them to his disciples. They illustrate every virtue before categorised ; so that the believer has before him not only the precepts, but

the actual examples of their realization in practice. "I have taught the truth which ■ excellent in the beginning, excellent in the middle, and excellent in the end: it is glorious in its spirit and glorious in its letter. But simple as it is, the people cannot understand it. I must speak to them in their own language. I must adapt my thoughts to their thoughts. They are like children, and love to hear tales. Therefore, I will tell them stories to explain the glory of the Dham. If they cannot grasp the truth in the abstract arguments, by which I have reached it, they may nevertheless come to understand it, ■ it is illustrated in parables."

These open up a wide field of literature which makes Buddhism a social servant, the incomparable morality of which has placed that religion in the forefront of all the ethical systems of the world. It is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SECRET DOCTRINE.

In the preceding pages the life and teachings of Gautam Buddha have been presented as they appear to the lay mind. But Buddhism has always had an esoteric side; and that side places Buddhist metaphysics in a plane higher and nobler than the base materialism to which it is held associated. That higher teaching will not be readily perceived by any one who reads only what Buddha spoke in his popular discourses addressed to the uninitiated. These have often been quoted to shew that Buddha denied the existence of God, which however, he never did. He is stated to have denied the existence of the soul; to have preached pessimism; to have exhorted his disciples to accumulate merit by the intensive cultivation of egoism, and all for the poor satisfaction of compassing their own annihilation hereafter and for ever. That is one view—but a superficial view which, if true, would never have gained him a single adherent, let alone half the humanity. The fact is that Buddha had to preach his creed to the savant and the savage alike, and the savants and savages alike followed his creed. We have at the one end the highly thoughtful Brahman and the sages who have devoted their lives to the study of the single question of life and death, and at the other, those, who, living on the slopes of the Himalayan mountains, have never given their thoughts to anything beyond the sheep they tend and the cattle they browse, from whom their little lives are scarcely distinguishable. That Buddhism should have equally appealed to them shows the simplicity and attractiveness of his doctrine. That it has for over two thousand years engrossed the best minds of the East and has materially influenced the Western thought—shews that there must be in the plain narrative of his doctrine an elasticity and a hidden meaning which only a closer study of his teachings can reveal. Taking the five questions, as far as possible, in their order

(1) The Soul, (2) God, (3) Nihilism, (4) Egoism, (5) and Pessimism, let us see if there is anything in his system which rises above the plain surroundings of his teaching.

And first as to his view of God: It has been stated before, that as often as he was questioned on the subject, he evaded a categorical reply. But who were his questioners? Only those who had either a low concept about God or no concept at all. And what does the ordinary man know, or can know about Him? It has been stated before, that the very limitations upon the human mind created the use of terms and expressions necessarily limited and applicable only to objects and things of which man is conscious. That consciousness is necessarily limited, indeed, so limited that human mind is unable to stretch its imagination beyond conceiving of God as only a glorified man. He, who wishes to have the best knowledge of God, must then expand his mind so that it rises above the things earthly, to perceive things eternal. He cannot describe them in human language. He can only feel Him; and then only when he has made his mind clear of human consciousness, because that consciousness ever drags him down to mundane analogies.

In fact, the Soul that becomes conscious of the Supreme Soul is not the human Ego that operates on the physical plane. The Ego is only a beam of light from that orb to which the presence of matter is an impediment. Man in his pride assumes that he alone possesses the Soul, which animals and the lower forms of life do not. The fact is that no life is possible without the Soul which is possessed by all alike, only that it varies in its measure and degree. Man upon earth has the highest form of the individual Soul, but he is not the limit of creation. As he rises in the scale of spirituality, he has to discard the human frame in which his larger soul feels cramped. When therefore the cessation of re-births is aimed at, it is not because rebirths are *per se* undesirable, but because the Soul, which has outgrown its limitations, seeks a wider sphere for its activity. It is like a child to whom the coat has become too small with the growth of his body. As he needs

a larger garment so the larger Soul needs a larger frame; and as such frame is unattainable in this world which is subject to re-births, there must be the cessation of re-births.

This is all that Nirvan means and can mean. It means that the human Soul has outgrown the receptacle in which it dwelt. And if you ask what reasons have you in support of your theory, Buddh replies that it all depends upon the "You". ■ you are an ordinary mortal, he has nothing by which to demonstrate his theory to you; since your mental apparatus is too crude to perceive it, nor has he the language in which to describe it to you. He has, however, this to say to you—that he is prepared to improve your mental apparatus and for that purpose he asks you to follow his esoteric teaching. If and when you have mastered it, you will then ask no questions; for you will not then have any questions to ask. Your apparatus being in order, you will answer that question for yourself. You will then begin to feel and perceive the larger life that will open up before you. You will have transcended the limited horizon of your own apperception. You will have then seen with your mind's eye your oneness with that universal Soul of which you have only a dim consciousness at times. It is a flickering light which comes and goes. It will become steadier as your mind expands, and when it has sufficiently expanded, you will need no other light to shew you the way.

The "Ego", then, which man thinks of, is the Ego the reality of which Buddh denies. It is the fetter of individuality, considered as the human Ego, which considers a mere sensation, perception, predisposition, in one word, consciousness as the only "Ego"—whereas it is no Ego at all—The "Ego" which men speak of is one thing: the "Ego" which Buddh teaches you to think of is quite another.

Without this Ego, Nirvan is inconceivable. The two Egos are not the same and yet they are not distinct. They are like the cocoanut fruit of which there is the shell and the kernel within; the shell is the individual "Ego" which receives the direct impact of sensations, the kernel is the larger Ego which

equally receives these impacts, though not directly; but nevertheless it does receive them and is influenced by their pressure. Both the Egos are subject to the moral law, the only law to which they can be subject. It is like a man who has to feed on roots, because there is nothing else to feed on.

The law of selflessness and self-discipline is obviously the right moral law because it appeals to the best instinct of man. The Soul that follows this law becomes purified and refined; and he, whose Soul has vanquished Self and mastered his desires, has already entered that blissful state of the mind when the blows and buffets of human craving disturb it not, when carnal cares and human vanities concern it not: when, freed from the trammels of Self and thralldom of passions, the individual Soul, emancipated from its prison-house of wordly wants, withdraws itself into its shell, rejoining the greater Soul within, refreshing and re-invigorating it, and producing in the mind a feeling of freedom and release from cares, directing its undisturbed attention to higher things. It is Nirvan, the state of supreme mental bliss. It is possible in this very life; but, since its union with the body is an ever-present danger of its debasement, the Nirvan is not final till the soul obtains its final liberation from the body.


After this, the Soul is completely emancipated and enters upon a higher plane of consciousness. It does not forget its past, because the past is only an experience, which it has no reason to remember or forget, but it can recall it whenever it pleases, much as the child can, if it so desires, recall the old coat in which it ran about till it had to be thrown away.

Nirvan is then only a higher state of human existence, with the infirmities of human life eliminated. When attained in life, it does not involve the destruction of self, though it arises only upon the suppression of selfishness. After death, there is no selfishness, because there is no individuality in the sense we understand it. The difference between "Mine" and "Thine" is as between limited creatures. It has no meaning, when there are no creatures at all to reckon with, when the so-called individual Soul has joined the greater Soul and the

two together have joined the universal Soul. The three were really at no time divided, but, one of them—the individual Soul—was merely indulging in a sort of sport during an infinitesimal part of its eternal existence.

We have now done with the ontological doctrine of God, the Soul and Nirvan. There remain the questions of the Buddhist pessimism and egoism. First, as to its pessimism. Buddhism is not pessimistic about the eventual destiny of man. It is not pessimistic about man's duty in life. What is it then pessimistic about? Only this—that life is transitory and man's participation in it involves misery and suffering brought about by man's struggle for Self—his so-called Self. The struggle is the outcome of his ignorance of the fact that everything in the world is impermanent, and that there is no such thing as "Self" at all. To the Vedantist the impermanence of the world was proof of its unreality: to Buddha it was the cause of its sorrow. He saw that man in his ignorance of his own Self,—of its true nature and purpose, nourished the body taking it to be real and lasting, but forgot to minister to the Soul which he degraded to become the handmaid of the body. Buddha saw that much of the misery of the world was inherent in its very constitution. He equally saw that added to it there was a great deal of preventible misery of which man's selfishness was the root cause. As regards the former, the only escape from it is the escape from the world: as regards the latter, it could be avoided if man would only subdue his selfish instinct; but this he would never do so long as he did not realize that it was the product of his ignorance. The ethos of the Vedantist is self-sacrifice, that of Buddhism self-mastery. The one is the outcome of self-deception, the other of self-realization.

But would the mere dispelling of ignorance eradicate his selfishness? Buddha knew only too well that it would not. His doctrine coupled with self-effacement the pleasure of Nirvan. It was not a mere sugar-coated pill but a reality as previously explained. The chastening of Self, its purification and refinement as leading to Nirvan, could not be described as either Egoistic or Hedonic. Nor could it be fairly described as ultra-stoical in that



it bade men to be virtuous because virtue was its own reward. It was so in a sense; but there was also its final reward.

Buddh did not teach men to wholly ignore their own individuality. Nor did he teach them to forget themselves. He did not teach men to love their neighbours more than themselves. But he did teach them to love them as much, and remember that they and their neighbours were all one but only temporarily divided, or seemingly so, by the blind wall of ap-
 perception. If this is the secret doctrine, let us next examine how far it is supported or contradicted by his public teaching.

Those who ascribe to him the denial of the Soul quote several instances, that when asked questions about eternal life, he evaded a straight reply. Dr. Oldenberg has devoted much space to this question, though Rhys Davids supports his conclusion by adopting another line of ratiocination. ⁽¹⁾ In the *Dhamm Sangani*, a manual of Buddhist Psychology in use since the fourth century B.C., man is described as an assemblage of different properties or qualities, none of which corresponds to the Hindu or modern notion of Soul. Referring to them, Buddh said: "Mendicants, in whatever way the different teachers ⁽²⁾ regard the Soul, they think it is the five *khandas* ⁽³⁾ or one of the five. Thus, mendicants, the unlearned, unconverted man who does not associate either with the converted or the holy, or understand their law, or live according to it,—such a man regards the Soul either as identical with, or as possessing, or as containing or as residing in the material properties (*rupe*), or as identical with, or as possessing, or as containing, or as residing in sensation (*Veđana*). ⁽⁴⁾ By regarding Soul in one of these twenty ways, he gets the idea, 'I am'. Then there are the five organs of sense, and mind, and qualities, and ignorance. From sensation (produced by contact and ignorance,) the sensual, unlearned man derives the notions 'I am', 'I exist'; 'I shall be', 'I shall not be'; 'I shall or shall not have material qualities'; 'I shall or shall not be without ideas'. ⁽⁵⁾ But now, mendicants, the learned

(1) *Buddhism* 89-95.

(2) Samans and Brahmans.

(3) *Khandas* or divisions of the qualities of sentient beings elaborately described,

see *Glossary*.

(4) See *Glossary*.

(5) And so on of each of the three *Khandas*, i.e., ideas, propensities, and mind.

disciple of the converted, having the same five organs of sense, has got rid of ignorance and acquired wisdom; and, therefore, by reason of the absence of ignorance and the rise of wisdom the ideas 'I am' (&c as above) do not occur to him." (1)

This is regarded as *Shakkya Ditti* or the heresy of individuality—a delusion which must be abandoned at the very first stage of the Buddhist path of freedom. The other being *attavaḍḍ* or "the doctrine of Soul or Self"—which is a part of the chain of causes which lead to the origin of evil. "Buddhism" says Rhys Davids in another place, "does not solve the problem of the primary origin of all things. When Malunk asked Buddha whether the existence of the world is eternal or not eternal, he made him no reply; but the reason of this was, that it was considered by the teacher as an inquiry that tended to no profit." (2) Now it seems that the first doubt is solved by the second. In the discourse quoted, Buddha distinguishes between the learned and the unlearned man and is setting out only the views of the "unlearned, unconverted man." He points out what produces in him the illusion of Self. He was not dealing with the learned or their view of the Soul; that is to say, of those who have passed beyond the stage of those who are still struggling in the delusion of treating a mere sensation as their individuality. Then as regards Malunk, who was a quizzical stranger, Buddha was not likely to engage with him into a discussion for which he regarded his ordinary Bhikkhus as unprepared.

Rhys Davids then gives Nagasen's familiar illustration of the chariot of which he names each part which he shews is not the chariot, a term which can only apply to the aggregate—that is to say, all the parts taken together. He then adds: "As the various parts of a chariot form, when united, the chariot, so the five *khandas* when united in one body, form a being, a living existence." This, at any rate, seems wide of the mark. Nagasen was here dealing with the meaning of individuality as distinguished from the soul. Rhys Davids was aware of it, for he goes on to add that his conclusion

(1) *Khandavagga* 5th Sutta.

(2) *Majjhima* I—430; cited in Hardy's *Buddhism* 87.

"Manual of Buddhism," R. Davids'

was supported "more clearly" from a curious passage in the *Brahmajal Sutta*, ⁽¹⁾ which mentions the sixty-two erroneous beliefs including the fallacy that "The Soul and the world are eternal; there ■ no newly-existing substance; but these remain as a mountain-peak unshaken and immovable. Living beings pass away, they transmigrate; they die and are born; but these continue as being eternal." Then again—"Upon which principle, or on what account, do these mendicants and Brahmans hold the doctrine of future existence? They teach that the Soul is material, or is immaterial, or is both or neither; that is, it is finite, or infinite, or both or neither, that it will have one or many modes of consciousness, that its perceptions will be few or boundless; that it will be in a state of joy or of misery, or of neither." Then occurs the final sentence: "Mendicants, that which binds the Teacher to existence is cut off; but his body shall remain, he will be seen by gods and men; but after the termination of life, upon the dissolution of the body, neither gods nor men will see him." It is with reference to this statement that the European scholars have held, as does Rhys Davids, that Buddha categorically denied the existence of Soul. He asks: "Would it be possible in a more complete and categorical manner to deny that there is any soul—any entity, of any kind, which continues to exist, in any manner, after death?" The answer is that Gautam was all along referring to the individual "Ego," the so-called Soul, which he has described as the creature of sensations. He was not referring to the *larger soul* without which he could not reconcile his views with his established doctrine of transmigration.

This is admitted by the learned author who goes on to write: "But Gautam had not been able to give up the belief in transmigration. He, like some other seekers after truth who are at the same time deeply religious, had gradually formed his beliefs—not by working up from the simple to the complex, from the well-known to the less known, and pausing humbly where uncertainty begins,—but by gradually rejecting those parts of his earliest creed which could be proved (to his mind) to

(1) *Digha Nikay* (P.T.S.)

be inconsistent with what he held to be actual fact. In such cases, every surrender causes a wrench; each stand-point is defended more strongly than the last; and the ultimate belief is not necessarily *more true* than those which have been abandoned; but only *less easily proved false*. How ever this may be, the belief was retained in Buddhism as proving a moral cause for the suffering condition of man in this birth; and as Buddhism does not acknowledge a Soul, it has to find the link of connection, the bridge between one life and another, somewhere else. In order to do this, and save the moral cause, it resorts to the desperate expedient of a mystery one of the four acknowledged mysteries of Buddhism (which are also the four points in which it is most certainly wrong) the doctrine, namely of Karm" (1)

The dialectical confusion of this reasoning is obvious. The question here is—did Buddha predicate or deny the existence of Soul? Rhys Davids started by shewing that he denied it and then winds up by shewing that he did not, because his creed was rooted on the doctrine of transmigration, which would have been inconsistent with his negation of the Soul. We are not here concerned with the sanity or soundness of his views on the law of Karm—we are directing our inquiry into the sole question whether Buddha denied the existence of Soul which outlived the dissolution of the human body. So far as Rhys Davids is concerned, his conclusion is clear that Buddha not only did not deny its existence but had constructed his whole creed upon the assumption of its continuance.

Let us next turn to Dr. Oldenberg who approached the question from another stand-point. His argument is embellished by many quotations which have already been accounted for in the preceding chapters. For the present, his argument will only be summarized as follows: (2) The Buddhist metaphysics was the very opposite of the Brahmins': "The speculation of the Brahmins apprehended being in all becoming; that of the Buddhists becoming in all apparent being. In

(1) The four points mentioned are: (1) Cosmos (Loka); (4) The omniscience &c. The effect of Karm; (2) The supernatural powers attained by *iddhi* (Saintship); of Buddh.
(2) *Buddhism* 99-101.
(3) The size, age and first cause of the

the former case, substance without causality; in the latter, causality without substance.”⁽¹⁾

Buddh refused to consider the possibility of the beginning or the end of things. To him the beginning of consciousness was the beginning of life: its end was its end: “The finite world appears in the dogmatics of Buddhism to rest wholly upon itself. Whatever we see, whatever we hear, our senses as well as the objects which are preserved to them, everything is drawn within the cycle of origination and decease; everything is only a *Dhamm*, a *sanskara* and all *Dhamms*, all *sanskars* are transitory. Whence this cycle? No matter whence; it is there, from a past beyond ken. The existence of the conditional is accepted as a given fact; thought shrinks from going back to the unconditional.”⁽²⁾ Whenever his venerable disciples were questioned on the existence of the Ego, they thus invariably added; “Whether the Ego is, whether the perfect saint lives after death or not, the exalted Buddha has taught nothing.”⁽³⁾ It is, however, admitted that the *Bhikkhus* who evaded a straight reply knew more than they were prepared to disclose. “If Buddha” he adds “avoids the negation of the existence of the Ego, he does so in order not to shock a weak-minded hearer. Through the shirking of the question as to the existence or non-existence of the Ego, is heard the answer, to which the premises of the Buddhist teaching tended: The Ego is not: or what is equivalent, the Nirvan is annihilation.”⁽⁴⁾ But is that the only inference possible and if it were so, what becomes of Buddha’s doctrine of transmigration and the doctrine of Karm? How is that possible, as Rhys Davids points out, without postulation of the eternal Ego? This will suffice for the professor’s third and last ground.

Let us next advert to his first ground. In the Buddhistic, doctrine a distinction was undoubtedly drawn between the Brahmanical *Maya* and the Buddhist Realism. To one, the Soul was only real, the world was a mere illusion; to the Buddhist apperceptions were all that was known, everything else was unknown.

(1) *Buddhism* 251.

(2) *Ib.* 270.

(3) *Ib.* 274.

(4) *Ib.* 273.

But it was the Buddhist psychology and not his metaphysics. It was an analysis of human consciousness; and in Buddhism, of all religions, psychology must be separated from metaphysics. This is admitted by no one more clearly than by Dr. Oldenberg himself: "The goal to which he pressed was, we must constantly repeat this, solely deliverance from the sorrowful world of origination and decease. Religious aspiration did not purposely and expressly demand that this deliverance should transport to nothingness, but when this was taught at all, expression was merely given thereby to the indifferent, accidental consequences of metaphysical reflections, which prevent the assumption of an everlasting immutable happy existence. In the religious life, in the tone which prevailed in the ancient Buddhist order, the thought of annihilation has had no influence." (1) But is it because it was taken for granted or was it because those privileged to know, knew that it was not and never could be the goal: otherwise how shall we reconcile it with the doctrine of eternal bliss of Nirvan and the deliverance only from re-births? This much Sariputta had made clear enough when he was questioned by the Brahman ascetic who asked him: "What is Nirvan?" To which Sariputta unhesitatingly replied, "The subjugation of desire, the subjugation of hatred, the subjugation of perplexity; this, O friend, is called Nirvan." (2) And the following words are put into the mouth of Buddha's most prominent disciples: "I long not for death; I long not for life; I wait till mine hour come, like a servant who awaiteth his reward. I long not for death: I long not for life: I wait till mine hour come, alert and with watchful mind." (3)

Dr. Oldenberg's second ground need not detain us. He would be the first to admit himself that whenever Buddha denied the persistence of the Ego, he did so about the Ego which originated with consciousness; it was the outer kernel of our illustration.

Buddhism, like other religions, has developed mysticism; and one aspect of the secret doctrine claims to connect the mortal with the immortal, the transitory with the eternal

(1) *Buddhism* 265.

(2) *Dhammapad* 414; *Samy. Nik.* 11.

(3) *Milinda Patha* 45.

verities of existence. The practice of *Yoge* is said to arm the *Yogi* with supernatural powers in this life and expand his sight into the unseen. It establishes a *nexus* between him and the celestial hierarchy who stand as above man as the brute creation stands below him. That in cosmic gradation while forms of lower life are infinite and many of them invisible, there is no reason to suppose that its manifestation in its highest form ■ necessarily visible and only culminates with man. That man cannot be the highest handiwork of Nature, is made apparent by his own physical evolution in countless years. That he could not have been the be-all and the end-all of Nature, can admit of no doubt. The mediæval astronomer placed the earth in the highest empyrean. He denied the possibility of other planets or other worlds. The modern astronomer admits that the earth is an insignificant and an obscure speck in the starry universe, and that there must be millions of other planets careering through space in which life of a higher and nobler amplitude must have manifested itself; and if we cannot accost an archangel in our mundane existence, is there no possibility of establishing a spiritual contact with them by the expanded power of the mind, by the whiter life of moral purity? The secret doctrine of Buddhism claims to give an insight into such transcendental truths, an insight to this vision glorious. But one need not expatiate upon such *a priori* possibilities. The fact still remains whether the method employed by the mystic and the *Yogi* takes him nearer to that objective. It is a question upon which one is entitled to entertain doubt; but it is a question which, the mystic believes, can only be answered *ambulando*.

Having so far cleared the ground we have still to see what there is in the teaching and doctrine of *Buddh* to support the hypothesis of his secret doctrine. It must be confessed that *Buddh* has composed no *Sutra* for the elite of his faith; nor has he anywhere set out the positive elements of his doctrine. But nevertheless it was not only the under-current of his views but his views became unintelligible without it. As has been already seen, the doctrine of *Karm* is a moral law and one which can have no place unless there is the continuity of

existence. His cycle of births and re-births, the reasons of which he had unfolded in his sorites of causation, would be meaningless without the externalization of Soul. His doctrine was preached to his disciples in its dual phases— to the generality of them he said: “As the great Sea, O disciples, is permeated by but one taste, the taste of salt, so also, O disciples, this doctrine and this law are pervaded by but one taste, the taste of deliverance.” Deliverance was then the goal, deliverance from suffering and the cycle of re-births; but deliverance into what? It cannot be nothingness, because it would not then be deliverance but annihilation. This was the opening vestibule to his doctrine of deliverance, the deliverance from the misery of life and delivery into eternal bliss. This Buddha again and again emphasized as the final goal of his teaching: for instance, when Magandhiya, a recluse, accused him of teaching revolutionary doctrines, Buddha replied to him in verse:

Health is the highest thing to get,
Nirvan is the highest bliss,
And of all paths the eightfold, 'tis
That unto deathless safety leads.

Whereupon Magandhiya exclaimed: “How strange and wonderful is it, Sir, that you should so aptly quote that verse! I have heard my teachers and their teachers also say it.” On another occasion, he enunciated the scope and limit of his teachings: “Bhikkhus, I will teach you the Dhamm as symbolized by a raft, as something to escape by, but not to be clung fast to. Suppose a man came midway on his journey to a great sheet of water, beset as to its hither bank with many perils, but safe and secure as to its further shore, and to cross which neither bridge nor ship is there. But suppose he takes grasses, brushwood and branches and binds together a raft, that thereon, toiling with hands and feet, he gains the further shore in safety. Now do you judge that he should, how greatly the raft had helped him, bear it along with him on his head and shoulders, or should he leave it stranded or floating, and go thence whither he wished?.....Even thus, Bhikkhus, understand that ye must put away moral rules, let alone immoral rules.”⁽¹⁾

(1) *Majjhima Nikay* I—134.

His *Dhamm* was then a raft and not a goal—a means to reach the other shore. What is that other shore? It is described in his very first sermon which he concluded as follows: "But when in these noble truths my three-fold knowledge and insight, duly with its twelve divisions was well purified, then, O Monks, in the world.....I had attained the highest complete enlightenment. Thus I knew. Knowledge arose in me, insight arose that the release of my mind is unshakable; this is my last existence; now there is no re-birth."⁽¹⁾ But this is only the negative gain. What is its outcome? It was clear from his advanced disciples what he meant. For instance, the sisters understood it to mean the attainment of a larger life, no longer fettered to a mortal frame but emancipated from its mortality and misery. They conclude their poem of joy with the following glowing thought:

Lo! the Nivanna of the little lamp!

Emancipation dawns! My heart is free! ⁽²⁾

In another *Sutta* the brothers understand the Master to have taught them to the same effect:—

"The factors of my life, well understood,

Stand yet a little while with severed root,

Sorrow is slain! That quest I've won, and won

Is purity from four-fold venom's stain."⁽³⁾

That *Buddh* had graded his teaching is clear from what he had himself said: "There are three grades of training, *Bhikkhus*; what are the three? The higher ethics,⁽⁴⁾ the higher consciousness, the higher insight (or wisdom). What is the higher ethics? When the *Bhikkhu* lives by the code of discipline and in conformity to the precepts of morality, when he sees danger in small offences, when having undertaken the precepts he practises them.

"What is the second grade? When a *Bhikkhu*, aloof from sense-appetites, aloof from evil thoughts, enters into and abides in the first *Dhyan*,⁽⁵⁾ wherein attention is directed and sustained, which is born of solitude and filled with zest and

⁽¹⁾ *Dharmak Appavattan Sutta*; *Samy.*
V—420;

⁽²⁾ *Psalm of the Sisters* 72;

⁽³⁾ *Sutta Nipat.*

⁽⁴⁾ *Sila*—*Gr. Ethos, Lit. habits.*

■ *Pali*—*Jhan*, "Rapt Meditation."

pleasurable emotion ; when next, from the subsiding of attention, initial and sustained, he enters into and abides in the second *Ādhyāna*, which is inward tranquillizing of the mind, self-contained and uplifted from the working of attention ; which is born of concentration, full of zest and pleasurable emotion ; when, next, through the quenching of zest, he abides indifferent, and enters and abides in the third *Ādhyāna*, mindful and fully conscious, experiencing in the body that pleasure whereof the Aryans (nobles) declare 'He who is indifferent, but mindful, dwells in happiness ;' and when next by putting away both pleasant and painful emotion, by dying out of the joy and misery he used to know, he enters into and abides in the fourth *Ādhyāna*, that utterly pure mindfulness and indifference wherein is neither happiness nor unhappiness."

"What is the third grade ? When a *Bhikkhu* knows, as it really is, that this is suffering ; this is the cause of suffering : this is the cessation of suffering ; this is the way leading to the cessation of suffering."

Then follow the verses describing the three stages ending with the following lines :—

To him when consciousness doth near its end,
To whom from craving utterly set free,
Nibbanna of the burning flame hath come,
And to his heart Release and Liberty. ⁽¹⁾

These discourses no doubt leave a blank at the end of the attainment of a larger consciousness. But as previously stated, it was not a subject for demonstration, and is therefore left alone, though the result attained by a liberated soul is unmistakably indicated. It has already been stated⁽²⁾ that *Buddh* had no secrets which he only imparted to his adept pupils or did not impart at all to any one. This is made clear in the *Patimoksh* itself where it is stated that *Buddh* had "no such thing as the closed fist of a teacher who keeps something back."⁽³⁾ But nonetheless Buddhism did develop an esoteric side, though it was ritual and not doctrinal being limited to the reading of the *Patimoksh* and the *Vinay Pitak* only in the

⁽¹⁾ *Anguttar Nikay* I. 236.

⁽²⁾ See Preface p. ■

⁽³⁾ Rhys Davids Tr. 36 cited 35 S.B.E. 267, 268 f.n.(3)

presence of the members of the Order.⁽¹⁾ As Rhys Davids observes: "The fact is that there has never been any such thing as esoteric teaching in Buddhism, and that the modern so-called esoteric Buddhism is neither esoteric nor Buddhism. Its tenets, so far as they are Indian at all, are perfectly accessible, are well known to all those who choose to study the books of Indian mysticism, and are Hindu, not Buddhist. They are, indeed, quite contradictory to Buddhism, of which the authors of what they ignorantly call esoteric Buddhism know but very little—that little being only a portion of those beliefs which have been common ground to all religious teachers in India."⁽²⁾ As already observed ⁽³⁾ the esoteric doctrine starts with the theory, patent enough, that this world is not the only world in space. The starry heavens disprove the contrary—and since it is one of the numerous worlds in the chain of creation in various degrees of evolution, such is also man. He is not without a beginning and with or without an end. He too has arisen in the process of evolution and will continue to pursue its circuit of evolution in which his life upon earth is only a brief incident. The esoteric doctrine invokes the aid of the law of Karm or predestination which it tries to reconcile with free-will, the one ruling the psychic law, the other the individual.

The constitution of man is resolvable into the following seven elements:—

(1) The body	<i>Rupe</i>	} Lower Principles.
(2) Vitality	<i>Jive or Pran</i>	
(3) Astral body	<i>Ling Sharir</i>	
(4) Animal Soul	<i>Kam Rupe</i>	
(5) Human Soul	<i>Manas</i>	} Higher Principles.
(6) Spiritual Soul	<i>Buddhi</i>	
(7) Spirit	<i>Atma or Atta</i>	

These are known as the seven principles of man. The first principle that enters into his composition is matter, the second imparts to it consciousness or life. It is the force of energy which vitalizes inorganic matter into an organic being. The third is the spiritual duplicate of the physical

⁽¹⁾ Rhys Davids Tr. 36 cited 35 S. B. E.
266 f. n. (1)

⁽²⁾ *Ib.* 268 f. n.

⁽³⁾ pp. 259, 260 *ante*

body. It guides *Jive* in its work on the physical particles, transforming them into the shape which they assume. At death it is disembodied for a brief period, and may for a time assume the shape and form of the body which it has left. It may vivify the particles of matter floating in the air and for the moment re-appear in the same form which men call ghosts of men's former selves. These three are the lower principles of man.

The fourth is the seat of will or desire. It is the root principle of the brute creation susceptible of evolution. The fifth is the seat of reason and memory which may be projected into space. It is this principle which remains undeveloped in man. When developed, it quickens to activity the sixth which otherwise remains in embryo. This, when developed, penetrates the seventh. The fifth and the sixth principles, when combined, preserve human individuality through a succession of lives. Human consciousness so far as it is sensuous, perishes with death but the spirit survives and passes into new bodies. The fact that every earthly mortal *Buddh* has his pure and glorious counterpart in the mystic world, free from the relative conditions of this material life, or rather that *Buddh* under material conditions is only an appearance, the reflection or emanation or a type of a "*Dhyani Buddh*" is a reality to the *Arhat*, the adept in the esoteric doctrine, which he can realise in his own life. His mental vision, enlarged by the practice of *Yoge*, transcends the bounds of space and time, penetrating the boundless empyrean and sees, as in a looking-glass, the process of evolution of man and spirit, appraising their relative values and inter-dependence and their true place in the great scheme of the Universe, all tending, with varying pace, to that grand event, to that sublime state of consciousness and a repose in omniscience—the eternal *Nirvan*.

The attainment of this larger insight is only possible by the strict regimen of *Self*—in one word, *Yoge*, which though Hindu in origin, was engrafted on to *Buddhism* as its esoteric doctrine. *Yoge* philosophy is intended to plumb the hidden

depths of the human mind. It proceeds on the assumption that the mind ■ man possesses latent powers which can neither be known, much less utilized, unless it goes through a severe training and a process of purification stimulating and manifesting its dormant capacity. According to *Yoge* philosophy man is composed of seven principles: (1) the physical body; (2) the vital force (*Pran*); (3) the astral body; (4) Instinctive mind; (5) the Intellect; (6) the Spiritual Mind; and (7) the Spirit. The physical body is the lowest and crudest manifestation of life, still, being the abiding place of Spirit, it has to be made a receptacle before the Spirit would make itself manifest. It is like the crude ore which, when cleansed, yields up its invaluable ingots which otherwise lie embedded and invisible in the dross. The *Hath Yoge* deals with the methods of its preservation in a state of health and purity. It teaches us how to maintain its health and strength. We have next the *Raj Yoge*, which similarly deals with the training of the mind and the development of its psychic powers. Then comes *Karm Yoge*, which deals with the freedom of the soul by means of work and development of altruism. It is the philosophy of service. Fourthly, we have the *Bhakti Yoge* allied to the last, which aims at perfection through love; while lastly comes the *Gyan Yoge*, which awakens the Spirit in its endeavour to obtain union with cosmic power—Brahm and opens the eye to universal consciousness. When the *Yogi* has purified his body and ennobled his mind, his vision is enlarged, his powers strengthened and his consciousness blending with the universal consciousness, he is able to manifold his psychic and physical energy and with its aid perform feats which, being out of the ordinary experience of mankind, are characterised as miracles. But this is merely incidental. The real fruit of this severe trial is the acquisition of wider knowledge of cosmic creation, its laws and purpose and its inter-relation to man and his destiny.

One such knowledge acquired by the *Yogi* is that of his past. Buddha had acquired such knowledge and some of the stories in the *Jatak* record the incidents of his previous lives.

Yoge has eight stages, the first four of which belong to the exoteric and the rest to its esoteric side. These are:—

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| (1) <i>Yam.</i> | (5) <i>Pratyahar.</i> |
| (2) <i>Niyam.</i> | (6) <i>Dharana.</i> |
| (3) <i>Asan.</i> | (7) <i>Dhyan.</i> |
| (4) <i>Pranayam.</i> | (8) <i>Samadhi.</i> |

The first of the stages in the Buddhist practice of Right Concentration is described as a state of mind from which for the time being, is banished all desire for the pleasurable and delightful, all craving for anything unwholesome, anything making for bondage to the things of sense. In this state, however, there is retained the faculty of taking up a subject of reflection and of dwelling upon it, turning it over and considering it at length; in the ordinary processes of it intellection remains active, their working being accompanied by a feeling of pleasure at this temporary release from the thralldom of attachment to objects of sense-delight.

In the second stage, the normal processes of thinking are left behind. There is no more taking up of a subject of thought and reflecting upon it. The mind exists in a state of simple existence, in the enjoyment of utter peace and tranquillity like that of a quiet lake whose smooth, glassy surface remains free from the disturbance of any reflected object. This state of concentration and tranquillisation is accompanied by a feeling of joy and bliss, that is the outcome of this same concentration and tranquillity.

In the third stage, the last shred of delight in the pleasures of sense, even of that most rarified, sublimated description is transcended, and there is experienced a tranquil, all-satisfying happiness, unshadowed by the least disturbance due to any anticipation of happiness to come. This last, technically called "*Piti*," entirely disappears and there supervenes a state of clear, unruffled, perfectly conscious bliss, the bliss of being done with all "that unrest which men miscall delight."

In the fourth stage, the very idea of such opposites as pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow is transcended, left

behind, all memory of any such things experienced in the past is clean wiped out, and a state of calm, clear, perfect collectedness of mind is experienced, into which there enters not the least trace of feeling of pleasure or of unpleasure, a state of equanimity, utter and complete.

The remaining four *Dhyans* or states of concentration which make up the eight, possess in common a subtler, more sublimated character than the four just mentioned.⁽¹⁾

These states have for their objective the attainment of eight-fold knowledge as follows:—

- (1) Discernment of the inter-relation between mind and body.
- (2) The supernatural hearing of voices and sounds both celestial and human—the distant becoming near.
- (3) Discernment of another person's mind.
- (4) Remembrance of previous lives and their incidents.
- (5) Super-normal vision enabling insight into the destinies of beings, dying and re-born.
- (6) Conscious extinguishment of the influence of sense—desires, ignorance and the desire for re-birth.
- (7) Evoking or creating a phantom body, the double of one's body at will.
- (8) Super-normal locomotion in which gravitation and opacity cease to obstruct.

All these are the subject of elaborate disquisition by Buddhaghosh⁽¹⁾ who proceeds on the assumption that by the purification of the body and the mind, by the development of its latent power of concentration, by training its "eye divine," man who looks such an abject creature of creation may easily become its master.

Buddh himself used to recount experiences of his previous re-births which would be illogical if he did not believe in the

⁽¹⁾ *Bhikkhū Silacara* : 10 Bud. Rer. 168, ⁽¹⁾ *Majjhima Nikāya* I—292.
169. (1918).

immortality of the Soul. But his conception of the Soul was obviously different and at variance with the sense ordinarily ascribed to that concept. But neither Buddhism nor, indeed, any other religion has been able to go beyond a vague expectation of a happier, fuller, and eternal life, the nature of which might be individually felt, but it cannot be proved. As Mrs. Rhys Davids writes: "And so without any definite belief as to how, or in what realm of the universe, he will re-arise as that successor to his present self, the pious Buddhist, no less than his pious brethren of other creeds, goes on giving money and effort, time and thought to good works, cheerfully believing that nothing of it can possibly forego its effect, but that it is all a piling up of merit or creative potency, to result, somewhere, somewhen, somehow, in future happiness—happiness which, though he be altruistic the while, is yet more a future asset of *his*, than of someone in whom he naturally is less interested than in his present self. He believes that, because of what he is now doing, someone now in process of mental creation by him, and to all intents and purposes his future 'self,' will one day taste less or more of life's trials. To that embryonic character he is inextricably bound, ever making or marring it, and for it he is therefore and thus far responsible."⁽¹⁾

That longing for such immortality is not merely a vague craving, but a revelation given only to those who have undergone the preparatory stage of bodily and mental purification and are prepared to engage in deep meditation. That meditation concentrates the mind and enlarges its vision is not only the doctrine of Yoge and the Buddhists', but one of those who by practice have learnt to appreciate its value:

"Nor, less I trust,
 To them many have owed another gift,
 ■ aspect more sublime; that blessed mood,
 In which the burden of the mystery,
 In which the heavy and the weary weight
 Of all this unintelligible world,

(1) *Buddhism*, 149.

■ lightened :—that serene, that blessed mood,
 In which the affections gently lead us on,
 Until the breath of this corporeal frame
 And even the motion of our human blood

Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
 In body, and become a living soul ;
 While with an eye made quiet by the power
 Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
 We see into the life of things."⁽¹⁾

It is this introspection, this *Dhyan*, which brings the soul in contact with the reality of the universe which eludes the search of consciousness and laboured ratiocination.

As regards the existence of a Supreme Deity, the question must either be susceptible of metaphysical demonstration or individual illation on the former subject. *Buddh* has already been quoted at length.⁽²⁾ It is clear from the *Pitaks* that *Buddh* did not believe in a salvation resulting from divine grace ; nor did he invoke any extraneous assistance to explain his cosmogony. To him the world appeared *Karak* ; not made, as it exists, but rather as one "without maker, without known beginning, continuing to exist by virtue of a concatenation of cause and effect."⁽³⁾ But while it disposed of the theory of paternal government, it did not deny the existence of God, though He was given no share in the plan of salvation. The latest view of Buddhism appears to have been that man's emancipated soul reached a higher plane—that of the gods whose elevation into the *Pushi* heaven brought them into contact with *Maitreya* (the *Buddh-to-be*) : *Buddhghosh* refers to it in the following words : "One who desires to practise recollection on divinities should practise it, endowed with the virtues of faith, etc., resulting in accordance with the Noble Path, and alone and secluded, he should set the divinities as witnesses, recollecting his virtues of faith etc. thus : there are the gods who are the four Great Kings, *Tritrinshat* gods (of the heaven of the Thirty-three),

(1) Wordsworth ; *Tintern Abbey*, lines 25—49 (Oxford Wordsworth) p. 208.

(2) Ch. XII "God or No God" *ante*.

Buddhghosh : *Way of Purity* XVIII.

(3) *Anguttar Nikay* III—287.

the Yama, Tushit, Nimmanarati and Pranimitt Vasvatti gods ; there are the gods of the Brahm world, and gods beyond these ; these gods endowed with such faith, have departed thence (from their former state) and have arisen here (i.e., in whatever heaven they now are). In me also such faith is found. Endowed with such morality.....with such learning.....with such renunciation...with such wisdom these gods have departed thence and have arisen here. In me also such wisdom is found."

The western conception of "God" is the Jewish conception of Jehovah, who, as already seen, was only their national God. The West has borrowed without scrutiny this concept with all its implications. "For eighteen centuries, more or less, the belief that the God of the Jews is the God of the universe, and that the Jewish scriptures are the word of God has lain like an incubus on the thought and conscience of the West. The time has come for criticism to say plainly that until this incubus has been finally exorcised, the higher thought of the West will not be able to awake from its long and troubled sleep."⁽¹⁾ Whatever might be said of the West, so far as India is concerned, its philosophy never encouraged a belief in a personal God. Its conception of Brahm was at first monotheistic and eventually developed into a Pantheistic ideal. Buddh appears to have combated this view : but what his own view was—must ever remain a subject of controversy.

Buddh had certainly granted the existence of Universal Energy which permeated all matter and was in all its movements controlled by an eternal, universal, inexorable law. He equally regarded matter a mechanism for the purification of the soul in its transit through corporeal forms, the course of which was determined by the degree of its own refinement. As such, it made every man the master of his own Destiny and so far opposed the Vedantic doctrine of priestly mediation and the obtaining of divine grace by devotion, sacrifice or any form of extraneous intervention. It is in this sense that he regarded

(1) *The Creed of Buddh*, 246 f.n.

his Dhamm or law as supreme. It dispensed with the necessity of a divine Creator in the sense in which that concept was understood by Hinduism or other religions. In this sense it may be asserted that Buddh never had to inquire, nor, indeed, did inquire into the remaining attributes of Divinity. So far Buddh could safely go some way with Varun in assuming the existence of "that *Spirit* from which all created beings proceed, in which having proceeded in which they live, towards which they tend, and in which they are at last absorbed; that spirit study to know, it is the Great One."

His teleological explanation of the universe was, indeed, that which the Vedantist had himself offered, though he could not reconcile that theory with Divine Government which ignored the uniform working of that law. A great writer, by no means friendly to his doctrine, had to admit that the philosophical ability displayed by him is very great, indeed, it may be doubted whether Europe has produced its metaphysical equivalent.⁽¹⁾

Buddh had to choose between the supremacy of the cosmic law and its denial in a Divine dispensation and he chose the former. But that alone did not rule him out as an atheist or an agnostic, unless these terms be used as they have been by the theologians of anthropocentric cult, in denouncing those who happen to disagree with their dogmas. Dr. Draper suggests that while Buddh was so far aided by his irrefragable logic, "his primary conception was not altogether consistently carried out in the development of the details." "Great," he goes on to add, "as was the intellectual ability of its author—so great as to extort our profoundest, though it may be reluctant, admiration, there are nevertheless moments in which it appears that his movement is becoming wavering and unsteady—that he is failing to handle his ponderous weapon with self-balanced power. This is particularly the case in that point in which he is passing from the consideration of pure force to the unavoidable consideration of visible nature, the actual existence of which he seems to be obliged to deny. But when I am not

(1) I Draper's *Intellectual Development of Europe*—72.

sure that I have caught with precision his exact train of thought or have represented his intention with critical correctness, considering the extraordinary power he elsewhere displays, it is more probable that I have failed to follow his meaning, than that he has been, on the points in question, incompetent to deal with his task."⁽¹⁾

The fact is that the philosophical historian had not then before him the first hand materials, since made available to European scholars. Buddh has, as explained in the previous chapter, consistently explained his view of the visible universe. He has dismissed the Vedantic theory of the visible being non-existent by demonstrating the imperfection and incompleteness of sensualism. This is admitted by Dr. Draper himself in another place where he says: "As to the eternal world, we cannot tell how far it is a phantom, how far a reality, for our senses possess no trustworthy criterion of truth. They convey to the mind representations of what we consider to be external things, by which it is furnished with materials for its various operations; but, unless it acts in conjunction with the senses, the operation is lost, as in that absence which takes place in deep contemplation. It is owing to our inability to determine what share these internal and external conditions take in producing a result that the absolute or actual state of Nature is incomprehensible by us. Nevertheless, conceding to our mental infirmity the idea of a real existence of visible nature, we may consider it as offering a succession of impermanent forms, and as exhibiting an orderly series of transmutations, innumerable universes in periods of inconceivable time, emerging one after another, and creations and extinctions of systems of worlds taking place according to a primordial law."⁽²⁾ This appears to be the conclusion to which Dr. Draper's inquiry equally drives him, and he leaves the question there.⁽³⁾ The fact is that it has then reached its metaphysical limit, beyond which there may be a line of thought but no real doctrine, a hope, an aspiration and a faith, probabilism but no proof.

(1) *Draper's Intellectual development of Europe*—72.

(2) *Ib.* pp. 69, 70.

(3) *Ib.* II. Ch. XII p. 394.

CHAPTER XVI.

HIS PRECEPTS AND PARABLES.

Like the dogmas of all religions, the entire creed of Buddhism is stated in a nut-shell—since it comprises nothing more than a knowledge of the four sacred truths of the origin of suffering and the eight-fold holy way to end it. These two formulas taken together exhaust the doctrine of Buddhism. All else is secondary, explanatory and supplementary. He who masters the two—the four truths and the eight-fold path of delivery becomes entitled to attain to Buddhhood.⁽¹⁾ But, in order to acquire that knowledge of pain and the means of delivery from it, the disciple must possess a guide which is provided by the precepts and practice of the Order and its members. A sufficiently comprehensive, though elastic chart is laid down for this purpose. It includes his moral precepts and parables which, though obligatory upon all his disciples, are to guide all who aspire to spiritual excellence. The two together occupy a considerable space in Buddhist literature. Nor are they classified according to the subject they deal with, nor is their rigid classification possible; but their trend can be gathered from the ensuing extracts, which have had in many places to be condensed.

Buddh has placed the practice of virtue above all religions—including his own. To him it is the conduct—and not the conventional compliance with the ritual which he had prescribed—that paved the way to eternity. And as before stated, while he insisted upon good conduct, he insisted most upon the formation of character. "Beware of the anger of the mind, and control thy mind! Leave the sins of the mind and practise virtue with thy mind."⁽²⁾ "Watching his speech, well-restrained in mind, let a man but keep three roads clear, and he will achieve the way which is taught by the wise."⁽³⁾ "A wise man may conquer a thousand battles, but

(1) *Dhammapaḍ*, XIV.—191, 192; 10
S. B. E. 53.

(2) *Ib.* XVII.—233; *Ib.* 60.

(3) *Ib.* XX.—281; *Ib.* 69.

he who conquers himself is the greatest conqueror.”⁽¹⁾ “A man is not a Bhikkhu, simply because he asks others for alms; he who adopts the whole law is a Bhikkhu, not he who only begs.”⁽²⁾ “Not only by discipline and vows, not only by much learning, not by entering into a trance, not by sleeping alone, do I earn the happiness of release which no worldling can know. O Bhikkhu! he who has obtained the extinction of desires, has obtained confidence.”⁽³⁾

I

HIS PRECEPTS.

BE TRUTHFUL.

Every man is born with an axe in his mouth, by which the fool cuts himself when using bad language.

Praise not the blame-worthy: nor blame the praise-worthy: He who does so, gathers up sin in his mouth, and that sin will not give him joy.

Riches lost by dice are trifling compared to the sin that corrupts the mind.

He who says ‘I have not done it’ when he has, lies.

He who offends an offenceless man, his sin recoils on him like dust blown against him by the wind.

Do not speak what you do not believe.

Do not talk loosely.

Do not revile the just. Do not backbite any one.

Do not flatter—do not please others by thy flattery.

All thy sins will recoil on thee, ye liar, O thou foul-mouthed, false, ignoble, blasting, wicked, evil-doing, low, sinful, base-born man: Hell’s burning fire awaits thee and such as thou art.⁽⁴⁾

BE GOOD.

Not to commit any sin, to do good, and to purify one’s mind—that is the teaching of all the Buddhas.⁽⁵⁾

(1) *Dhammapad*, VIII—103; *Ib.* 31.

(2) *Ib.* XIX—266; *Ib.* 66.

(3) *Ib.* XIX—271, 272; *Ib.* 67.

(4) (This and the following Suttas

are abridged in the text). *Kokaliya Sutta* 10 S. B. E. 116-122.

(5) *Dhammapad*, XIV 183; 10 S. B. E. 51.

He abused me, he beat me, he defeated me, he robbed me—in those who harbour such thoughts hatred will never cease; but in those who do not harbour such thoughts hatred will cease. For, hatred does not cease by hatred at any time: hatred ceases by love, this is an old rule.”⁽¹⁾ “They who imagine truth in untruth, and see untruth in truth, never arrive at truth, but follow vain desires. They who know truth in truth, and untruth in untruth, arrive at truth, and follow true desires.”⁽²⁾ “The virtuous man is happy in this world, and he is happy in the next; he is happy in both. He is happy when he thinks of the good he has done; he is still more happy when going on the good path.”⁽³⁾

BE SINCERE.

Then he exhorts people to be earnest. “By rousing himself by earnestness, by restraint and control, the wise may make for himself an island which no flood can overwhelm. Fools follow after vanity, men of evil wisdom. The wise man keeps earnestness as his best jewel. He who is earnest and meditative obtains ample joy.”⁽⁴⁾ “Earnest among the thoughtless, awake among the sleepers, the wise man advances like a racer, leaving behind the pack.”⁽⁵⁾

He then exhorts people to guard their thoughts: “They are difficult to perceive, very artful, and they rush wherever they list: thoughts well-guarded, bring happiness. If a man’s thoughts are not dissipated, if his mind is not perplexed, if he has ceased to think of good and evil, then there is no fear for him while he is watchful. As a fletcher makes straight his arrow, a wise man makes straight his trembling and unsteady thought, which is difficult to guard, difficult to hold back; whatever a hater may do to a hater, or an enemy to an enemy, a wrongly directed mind will do himself greater mischief.”⁽⁶⁾

Then he inveighs against insincerity. “Like a beautiful flower, full of colour but without scent, are the fine but

(1) *Dhammapad* 3-6; 10 S. B. E. 4, 5.

(2) *Ib.* 11, 12; 10 S. B. E. 6.

(3) *Ib.* 18, 19; 10 S. B. E. 7, 8.

(4) *Ib.* 25, 26; 10 S. B. E. 10.

(5) *Ib.* 29; *Ib.* 10.

(6) *Ib.* Ch. III *Ib.* 12, 15.

fruitless words of him who does not act accordingly. As a lily will grow on a dung-hill and will exude its perfume, so shall the wise man shine forth by his knowledge. As the bee collects nectar and departs without injuring the flower, or its colour or scent, so let a sage dwell in his village."⁽¹⁾

BE ALERT.

Next follows a sermon on fools: "Long is the night to him who is awake. Long is a mile to him who is tired; long is the life to the foolish who do not know the true law."

ROUSE THYSELF.

Do not be idle! Follow the law of virtue! The virtuous man rests in bliss in this world and in the next. ⁽²⁾

"If a traveller does not meet with one who is his better, or his equal, let him firmly keep to his solitary journey; there is no companionship with a fool."

"The fool who knows his foolishness is wise, at least so far. But a fool who thinks himself wise, he is a fool indeed."

"If a fool be associated with a wise man, even all his life, he will perceive the truth as little as a spoon perceives the taste of soup."

"If an intelligent man be associated for one minute only with a wise man, he will soon perceive the truth, as the tongue perceives the taste of soup."

"Fools of poor understanding are their own worst enemies, for they do evil deeds which bear bitter fruits."

"As long as an evil deed does not bear fruit, the fool thinks it is like honey; but when it ripens, then the fool suffers grief."⁽³⁾

PEARLS OF WISDOM.

After the fool, comes the wise man. ■ course the wisest thing he can do is to turn a Bhikkhu; but if he does not dare go so far, he has still to remember

(1) *Dhammapad*, Ch. IV; 10 S.B.E. 16-19. (2) *Ib.* Ch. V.; *Ib.* 20-22.

(3) *Ib.* XIII—168; *Ib.* 47.

that it is always best to look at the bright side of things. A wise man must choose his friends wisely. He must consort with the virtuous and not with low and evil men. A wise man will follow the lead of a wise man. He should be steadfast in his aim and purpose. "As a solid rock is not shaken by the wind, wise people falter not amidst blame and praise. They remain self-possessed and composed whether in joy or in sorrow."⁽¹⁾

A man must avoid verbosity in thought and speech—an advice, which, judging from the verbosity and tiresome repetitions of the Suttas, the venerable disciples had followed too well in its breach rather than its observance. All the same, the advice is there.

"One word of sense is better than a thousand senseless words. One day passed in wisdom and reflection is better than one hundred years of vicious and unbridled life."

The wise man should not think that the good he ■ striving for is unattainable. As by the falling drops, the water-jug is filled; so by his small efforts, his purpose will be achieved. If a man does what is good, let him do it again; let him take pleasure in it: the accumulation of good is delightful, as much as the accumulation of evil is painful.

If a man offend a harmless, pure and innocent person, the evil falls back upon that fool, like dust thrown up against the wind.⁽²⁾

He who seeking his own happiness, punishes or kills beings, who also long for happiness, will not find happiness after death.

Do not speak harshly to anybody; those who are spoken to, will answer thee in the same way. Angry speech is painful, blows for blows will touch thee.⁽³⁾

So we have in the proverbs of Solomon. "A soft answer turneth away wrath: but grievous words stir up anger: the

(1) *Dhammapad*, Ch. VI; 10 S. B. E.
23-26.

(2) *Ib.* IX—125; *Ib.* 35.

(3) *Ib.* X—132, 133; *Ib.* 37.

tongue of the wise useth knowledge aright; but the mouth of fools poureth out foolishness." (1)

"A fool does not know when he commits his evil deeds: but the wicked man burns by his own deeds, as if burnt by fire. There is no satisfying lusts even by a shower of gold pieces: he who knows that lusts have a short taste and cause pain, ■ wise." (2)

KNOW THYSELF.

He who formerly was reckless and afterwards became sober, brightens up this world, like the moon when freed from clouds. (3)

The fault of others is easily perceived, but that of one's self is difficult to perceive; a man winnows his neighbour's faults like chaff, but his own faults he hides, as a cheat hides the bad die from the player. ■ a man looks after the faults of others, he is always inclined to be offended, his own passions will grow, and he is far from the destruction of passions.

Self is the lord of self, who else could be the lord? With self well-subdued a man finds a lord such as few can find. Bad deeds and deeds hurtful to ourselves are easy to do, what ■ beneficial and good, that is very difficult to do—an ancient rendering of the modern proverb "Ill weeds grow apace."

"Let each man first teach himself what is right, let him then teach others," which has its parallellism in the 'Doctor cure thyself.'

"But life is hard to live for a modest man, who always looks for what is pure, who is disinterested, quiet, spotless, and intelligent." (4)

SUBDUE EVIL DESIRES.

If one longs for happiness let him cast off all desires; he who has cast off all desires will find the most perfect happiness.

(1) *Proverbs* XV—1, 2. 10 S. B. E.

(2) *Ib.* XIV. 186; *Ib.* 52.

(3) *Dhammapad*, XIII—173; *Ib.* 47.

(4) *Ib.* XVIII—245; *Ib.* 62.

As long as one follows after desires, one finds no satisfaction; they, who through wisdom have given ■ up, find contentment.

Desires are never satiated, wisdom affords contentment: he who has the contentment of wisdom cannot fall into the power of lust. They who have fondness for pleasure and who delight only in what is wrong would not perceive the danger they run, even if their life were drawing to a close.

"The evil-minded is subdued by wealth and seeks not after the other world; his mind is subverted by his fondness for desires, he brings destruction on himself and on others."

"Even a mountain of riches like unto Himavat would not suffice for the wealth of a single man; he who has understanding knows this full well."

"They who know that this (i.e. desire) is the origin of sorrow, how can they delight in pleasures? Having learnt that this is the cause of pain in the world, they acquire steadfastness to help to control themselves."⁽¹⁾

BE VIRTUOUS.

Look where you will, there is nothing dearer to man than himself; therefore, as it is the same thing that is dear to you and to others, hurt not others with what pains yourself.

"To all men this life is dear; all men fear punishment; you who are like unto them, strike not, put not to death."

"He who has been to a great distance, and who returns from afar without mishap, his assembled kinsfolk, and friends receive him with joyful cries of *Alal*; so likewise, he who has been virtuous, on arriving from this world into another, his good works receive him like kinsfolk and welcome him."

"Lay up, therefore, good works in view of the other world; for it is good works that receive beings in the other world."

(1) *Udanvarg* (Trubner) 11, 12.

"He whose life is one of virtue is praised by the gods; he, in whom there is nothing to be blamed, finds perfect joy in heaven."⁽¹⁾

BE JUST.

A man is not just if he carries a matter by violence; no, he who distinguishes both right and wrong, who is learned and guides others, not by violence, but by the same law, being a guardian of the law and intelligent, he is called just.

"A man is not learned nor respectable, because he talks much, nor an elder because his head is grey; he is learned, if he is patient, free from hatred and fear, free from impurity; respectable, if free from hatred; an elder, if free from impurity."⁽²⁾

GUARD YOUR TEMPER.

'He who holds back rising anger like a rolling chariot, him I call a real driver; other people merely hold the reins.

"Let a man overcome anger by love, let him overcome evil by good; let him overcome the greedy by liberality, the liar by truth."⁽³⁾

"He who restrains his anger when it has arisen, as one who by medicine restrains the spread of the venom from spreading in the body, that Bhikkhu leaves this and the further shore as the snake discards his worn out skin."⁽⁴⁾

"Beware of bodily anger, and control the body; leave the sins of the body, and with thy body practise virtue!

"Beware of the anger of the tongue, and control thy tongue! Leave the sins of the tongue, and practise virtue with thy tongue.

"Beware of the anger of the mind, and control thy mind! Leave the sins of the mind, and practise virtue with thy mind.

(1) *Dhammapad*, XVIII—245; 10 S.B.E. 62. (2) *Uragavagga* 1; *It*. 1.

(3) *It*. XVII—222, 223, *It*. 59.

(4) *It*.

"The wise who control their body, who control their tongue, the wise who control their mind, are indeed well-controlled."⁽¹⁾

PERSEVERE.

If anything is to be done, let a man do it, let him attack it vigorously. A careless pilgrim only scatters the dust of his passions more widely.⁽²⁾

"It is an old saying, O Atul; this is not as if of to-day: They blame him who sits silent, they blame him who speaks much, they also blame him who says little; there is no one on earth who is not blamed."⁽³⁾

"The world gives according to their faith or according to their pleasure: if a man frets about the food and the drink given to others, he will find no rest either by day or by

AS OTHERS SEE US.

"There never was, there never will be, nor is there now, a man who is always praised. The fault of others is easily perceived, but that of oneself is difficult to perceive; a man winnows his neighbour's faults like chaff, but his own fault he hides, as a cheat hides the bad die from the player.

"If a man looks after the faults of others, and is always inclined to be offended, his own passions will grow, and he is far from the destruction of passion."

SOCIAL TIES.

In a dialogue with a deity, Buddha outlined the conduct which stands to a man's credit or debit in this world. Placing the knowledge of Dhamm above all, he proceeds to enumerate the causes of loss to the losing man as follows:—

"The man who is drowsy, fond of society, and without energy, lazy and given to anger:

(1) *Dhammapad*, 232-234; 10 S.B.E. 60.
(2) *Ib.* 313; *Ib.* 76.

(3) *Ib.* 227; *Ib.* 59, 60.
(4) *Ib.* 349; *Ib.* 63.

“He who, being rich, does not support old parents:

“The man who, proud of his birth, of his wealth, and of his family, despises his relations: or enjoys alone his sweet things:

“He who, not satisfied with his own wife, is seen with harlots and the wives of others.”⁽¹⁾

According to the Brahmanical system a person lost his caste, if he failed to follow some ceremonial rule of the caste: e.g., eating food or drinking water touched by a person of a lower caste. Bad conduct did not matter. Buddha denounces bad conduct and shows that a man deserves to be an outcast, not because of his ceremonial impurity, but because of his evil conduct. He upholds the true, and denounces false notions of morality:—

He says—

“Deeds, not birth, make a man a Brahman: deeds not birth make him an outcast.”⁽²⁾

“Deeds, not birth, carry a man to heaven: they hurl him into hell. Birth cannot save man from his doom which awaits his evil deeds. He is not defiled because he eats the forbidden food, but because he commits forbidden and wicked deeds.”⁽³⁾

“The outcast Matanga goes to heaven because of his deeds; and there was waited on by the Kshatriyas and Brahmins.”⁽⁴⁾

“A man is then an outcast, who is angry and bears hatred, who is wicked and hypocritical, who has embraced wrong views, who is deceitful;

“Who has no compassion for living beings and harms them;

(1) *Parabhav Sutta* 1-25; 10 S. B. E. (Pt. 2) 17-19.

(2) *Vasala Sutta* 27; *Ib.* (Pt. 2) 23.

(3) *Amangandh Sutta*; *Ib.* (Pt. 2) 39-41.

(4) *Ib.* 23; To the same effect *Amangandh Sutta* 1-14; ■ (Pt. 2) 39-41; cf. *Matthew* XV—10.

"Who appropriates by theft what ■ another man's property, or one who is the receiver of such stolen property ;

Who for a trifle kills another on the road ;

Who lies or bears false witness ;

Who strives or by words annoys mother, father, brother, sister or mother-in-law ;

Or being rich does not support his old parents ;

Or goes after the wife of another ;

Or who lays siege to a village and destroys it ;

Who being asked for advice, knowingly gives false advice ;

Who by falsehood deceives another ;

Who poses as a prophet of future events—

He and such as he are all outcasts."⁽¹⁾

BE COMPASSIONATE.

"As a mother at the risk of her life watches over her own child, her only child, so also let every one cultivate a boundless (friendly) mind towards all beings."

"Let him see that all creatures are happy :

"Let him not do anything mean, for which others who are wise, might reprove him :

"Standing, walking or sitting or lying, as long as he be awake, let him devote himself to this mind ; this (way of) living—they say, is the best in the world.

"He who is virtuous and endowed with perfect vision, subdues greediness for sensual pleasure, will himself never again go to a mother's womb."⁽²⁾

TEST OF FRIENDSHIP.

True friendship lies in deeds, not words.

"He who proclaims—'I am a friend'—but does no work to prove it, is not a friend.

⁽¹⁾ *Vasala Sutta* 1-27 (condensed in ■ *Metta Sutta*, 1-10 ; *Ib.* 24, 25. the text) ; 10 S. B. E. (Pt. 2) 20-24,

"Friends are friends, if nothing can separate them.

"They are friends, if they cling to each other as the child clings to his mother's breasts."

HIGHEST BLESSINGS.

"Asked by a deity to enumerate the highest blessings Buddha describes them:—

"Thorough study of one's self; he, whose mind is not shaken (when he is) touched by the things of the world, but remains free from sorrow, free from defilement, and secure (therefrom):

"Cultivation of the society of the wise and avoidance of that of fools:

"Worship of those worthy of it:

"Great learning and skill, well-learned discipline, contentment and gratitude, the hearing of the Dhamm at due sessions; abstaining from sin, reverence and humility, contentment and gratitude refraining from intoxicating drinks, penance and chastity, patience and pleasant speech.

"He whose mind is not shaken when he is touched by the things of the world (but remains) free from sorrow and free from defilement—this is the highest blessing."⁽¹⁾

Buddh's religion is a religion of forgiveness; and he himself loves his enemies even when they had attempted to murder him. But nevertheless when he was questioned on this subject by an Army General, he reconciled his view to that of retribution. The General had asked for his consent to clear up one doubt which remained in his mind.

The Tathagat having given his consent, Simha said: "I am a soldier, O Blessed One, and am appointed by the king

(1) *Mahamangal Sutta* 1-12. (Condensed in the text); ■ S. B. E. (Pt. ■ 42, 43.

to enforce his laws, and to wage his wars. Does the Tathagat, who teaches kindness without end and compassions with all sufferers, permit the punishment of the criminal? And further, does the Tathagat declare that it is wrong to go to war for the protection of our homes, our wives, our children, and our property? Does the Tathagat teach the doctrine of a complete self-surrender, so that I should suffer the evil-doer to do what he pleases, and yield submissively to him who threatens to take by violence what is my own? Does the Tathagat maintain that all strife, including such warfare as is waged for a righteous cause, should be forbidden?"

Buddh replied: "The Tathagat says: 'He who deserves punishment, must be punished, and he who is worthy of favour must be favoured. Yet at the same time, he teaches to do no injury to any living being, but to be full of love and kindness. These injunctions are not contradictory, for, whosoever must be punished for the crimes which he has committed, suffers his injury not through the ill-will of the judge, but on account of his evil-doing. His own acts have brought upon him the injury that the executor of the law inflicts. When a magistrate punishes, let him not harbour hatred in his breast; yet a murderer, when put to death, should consider that this is the fruit of his own act. As soon as he will understand that the punishment will purify his soul, he will no longer lament his fate but rejoice at it.'"

And the Blessed One continued: "The Tathagat teaches that all warfare in which man tries to slay his brother is lamentable, but he does not teach that those who go to war in a righteous cause, after having exhausted all means to preserve the peace, are blameworthy. He must be blamed who is the cause of war."

"The Tathagat teaches a complete surrender of self, but he does not teach a surrender of anything to those powers that are evil, be they men or gods or the elements of Nature. Struggle must be, for all life is a struggle of some kind. But he that struggles should look to it, lest he struggles in the of self against truth and righteousness.

"He who struggles in the interest of self, so that he himself may be great or powerful or rich or famous, will have no reward; but he who struggles for righteousness and truth, will have great reward, for even his defeat will be ■ victory.

"Self is not a fit vessel to receive any great success; self is small and brittle, and its contents will soon be spilt for the benefit, and perhaps also for the curse of others.

"Truth, however, is large enough to receive the yearnings and aspirations of all selves, and when the selves break like soap-bubbles, their contents will be preserved and in the truth they will lead a life everlasting.

"He who goeth to battle, O Simha, even though it be a righteous cause, must be prepared to be slain by his enemies, for that is the destiny of warriors; and should his fat over take him he has no reason for complaint.

"But he who is victorious should remember the instability of earthly things. His success may be great, but be it ever so great, the wheel of life may turn again and bring him down into the dust.

"However, if he moderates himself and, extinguishing all hatred in his heart, lifts his down-trodden adversary up and says to him, 'come now and make peace and let us be brothers,' he will gain a victory that is not a transient success, for its fruits will remain for ever.

"Great is a successful general, O Simha, but he who has conquered self is the greater victor.

"The doctrine of the conquest of self, O Simha, is not taught to destroy the souls of men, but to preserve them. He who has conquered self is more fit to live, to be successful, and to gain victories than he who is the slave of self.

"He whose mind is free from the illusion of self, will stand and not fall in the battle of life.

"He whose intentions are righteousness and justice, will meet with no failure, but be successful in his enterprises and his success will endure.

"He who harbours in his heart love of truth, will live and not die, for he has drunk the water of immortality.

"Struggle then, O general, courageously; and fight your battles vigorously, but be a soldier of truth, and the Tathagat will bless you."

When the Blessed One had spoken thus, Simha, the General said: "Glorious Lord, glorious Lord! Thou hast revealed the truth. Great is the doctrine of the Blessed One. Thou, indeed, art the Buddha, the Tathagat, the Holy One. Thou art the teacher of mankind. Thou showest us the road of salvation, for this indeed is true deliverance. He who follows thee will not miss the light to enlighten his path. He will find blessedness and peace. I take my refuge, Lord, in the Blessed One, and in his Doctrine, and in his Brotherhood. May the Blessed One receive me from this day forth while my life lasts as a disciple who has taken refuge in him."

And the Blessed One said: "Consider first, Simha, what you are doing. It is becoming that persons of rank like you, do nothing without due consideration."

Simha's faith in the Blessed One increased. He replied: "Had other teachers, Lord, succeeded in making me their disciple, they would carry around their banners through the whole city of Vaishali, shouting: 'Simha, the General, has become our disciple!' For the second time, Lord, I take my refuge in the Blessed One, and in the Dharma, and in the Sangha. May the Blessed One receive me from this day forth while my life lasts, as a disciple who has taken his refuge in him."

Said the Blessed One: "For a long time, Simha, offerings have been given to the Nirgranthas in your house. You should therefore, deem it right also in the future to give them food when they come to you on their alms-pilgrimage."

And Simha's heart was filled with joy. He said: "I have been told, Lord: 'The shraman Gautam says: 'To me alone and to nobody else gifts should be given. My pupils

alone and the pupils of no one else should receive offerings.' But the Blessed One exhorts me to give also to the Nirganthas. Well, Lord, we shall see what is reasonable. For the third time, Lord, I take my refuge in the Blessed One, and in his Dhamm, and in his fraternity."⁽¹⁾

King Milind had put a similar question to Nagsen to which the latter replied to the same effect, though his reasoning was thoroughly illogical:

K. "Is then, Nagsen, the execution of robbers part of the doctrine laid down by the Tathagatas?"

N. "Certainly not, O king."

K. "Then why have the Tathagatas laid down that the robber is to be taught better?"

N. "Whosoever, great king, may be put to death, he does not suffer execution by reason of the opinion put forth by the Tathagatas. He suffers by reason of what he himself has done. But notwithstanding that the doctrine of the Dhamm has been taught (by the Buddhs), would it be possible, great king, for a man, who had done nothing wrong, and was walking innocently along the streets, to be seized and cut to death by any wise person?"

K. "Certainly not."

N. "But why?"

K. "Because of his innocence."

N. "Just so, great king, since the thief is not put to death through the word of the Tathagatas, but only through his own act, how can any fault be rightly found on that account with the Teacher?"

K. "It could not be, Sir."

N. "So you see the teaching of the Tathagatas is a righteous teaching."

(1) Carus: *Gospel of Buddha* 126-130.

K. "Very good, Nagsen! That is so, and I accept it as you say."⁽¹⁾ Nagsen might have added that the thief would never have been the thief, if he had observed the precepts of the Blessed One, and that he who punishes the thief, does so, not because he loves punishment, but because it is for his own good in future life, as also because it reduces the sufferings of others."

SHUN PRIDE.

"Be calm and shun pride: Shun women; cultivate equanimity: be not covetous: let thy wants be few. Take whatever is offered; and bless the giver for his gift. What thou hast not got, be thankful that thou hast got something: curb thy desire. Be moderate in thy diet.

"Understand this from the waters in chasms and cracks: noisy go the small waters: the vast ocean is still. He who is self-restrained: he who curbs his tongue—he has attained wisdom."⁽²⁾

AVOID SENSUAL PLEASURES.

"If thou desirest sensual pleasure, thou shalt get it: but when it fails there is pain.

"He who avoids sensual pleasure, avoids treading on the hood of a snake.

"He who covets pleasure, will find pain close at his heels, which will overwhelm him like a sheep with a broken knee.

"Therefore avoid sensual pleasures."⁽³⁾

AVOID WORLDLINESS.

"Short indeed is this life; one dies within one hundred years and if one lives longer, then he dies of old age.

"People grieve from selfishness: perpetual cares kill them. This world is full of disappointment: hence let no one live in a house.

"All that a man thinks: "This is mine"—is left behind by death. Knowing this, let not the wise turn himself to worldliness.

(1) *Mūlinda IV*—2-37; 35 S. B. E. 250.
257.

■ *Kam Sutta* 10 S. B. E. 143-1-10;
10 S. B. E. 151, 152.

(3) *Nalaka Sutta*; ■ S. B. E. 123-129.

"As a man awakened does not see those he saw in his sleep, so he does not see the beloved ones who have passed away and are dead.

"A monk who has no attachments and cultivates the mind of a recluse, does not re-appear after death.

"As a drop of water does not stick to a lotus, so let the sage not cling to the objects of sensation."⁽¹⁾

AVOID DISPUTATION.

"Avoid disputation: it leads to mutual abuse and vain glorification of self.

"After the heat of controversy, the disputant regrets having lost in the dispute. He wails, because he is beaten; and if he wins and is applauded, it leads to pride and arrogance. Therefore dispute not as it leads to no purification of self.

"Those who go about proclaiming 'This is my doctrine, it only is true,' say, 'There is no opponent for thee.'⁽²⁾

"A disputant thinks himself superior, distinguished or low, but he who is unmoved by such failing, to him the not 'equal' and 'distinguished' do not exist."⁽³⁾

"Let not the sage, homeless and a wanderer free from lust and without craving for future existence, free from greed, confessor of peace, get into quarrelsome talk with people."

II

HIS PARABLES.

Buddh couched his popular teachings in the form of parables and stories—a practice which Christ equally made his own. He justified this mode of instruction on the obvious ground that it went to the head through the heart and was, therefore, as easily understood as it was retained. He thought: "I have taught the truth which ■ excellent in the beginning,

⁽¹⁾ *Garh Sutta* 1-10; 10 S. B. E. 150, 151.

⁽²⁾ *Parier Sutta* 1-11; ■ S. B. E. 153, 154.

⁽³⁾ This clause and the following are taken from *Magandiya Sutta* 8-12; 10 S. B. E. 155, 156.

excellent in the middle, and excellent in the end ; it is glorious in its spirit and glorious in its letter. But simple as it is, the people cannot understand it. I must speak to them in their own language. I must adapt my thoughts to their thoughts. They are like unto children, and love to hear tales. Therefore, I will tell them stories to explain the glory of the Dham. If they cannot grasp the truth in the abstract arguments by which I have reached it, they may nevertheless come to understand it, ■ it ■ illustrated in parables."

The following parables and stories carry their own moral.

WHY PRAY ?

Vashisth and Bharadvaj were two Brahmins. They had a quarrel about the right path to salvation. The young Brahmin—Vashisth said that the direct way to reach Brahm was that pointed by the Brahmin Pushkarasadi ; but the other denied this, and said the path was that announced by the Brahmin Tarukh ; whereupon Vashisth suggested their going to consult Buddh, who was then encamped in the neighbourhood. They both went to him and stated their difficulty. "Where is then the dispute ?" asked Gautam "Why, this" replied Vashisth, "that there are six Brahmins and each of them says his is the only way."

"Well" asked Buddh, "is there any of them who has seen Brahm ?"

"No indeed, Gautam."

"Or their disciples ?"

"No."

Then added Gautam, "They show you the path which they themselves have not seen and of which they know nothing : Is it not foolish, is it not like the blind leading the blind ?"

Vashisth assented.

Then Gautam continued : "Suppose a man should say 'I love the most beautiful woman in this land,' and people should ask him, whether she is a Kshatriya, a Brahmin, a Vaishya or a Shudra. And so asked, he should say 'No.'

And when he is asked—‘ what is her family name, her own name, whether she is tall or short, dark or fair or in what town or city she lives ? ’ and the answer will be the same. Would ■ not be loving and longing for a woman, whom one never knew nor had ever seen ? Now Vashisth—what do you think of such a man, will not he be called a fool who talked about loving a woman he knew nothing about ? ”

Vashisth, of course, agreed.

“ Then,” said Gautam “ Is not the talk of the Brahmans equally foolish. Neither they nor any one up to the seventh generation, nor indeed, any one has seen where, or whence, or whither Brahm is, and yet they profess to show you the way to Him. Does it not follow, Vashisth, that the talk of the Brahmans versed in the three Vedas is foolish talk ?

“ Just, Vashisth, as if a man should make a stair-case in the place where four roads cross, to mount up to a mansion. And people should say to him ‘ well good friend, this mansion, to mount up into which you are making this staircase, do you know whether it is in the east, or in the south, or in the west, or in the north ? Whether it is high or low or of medium size ? ’ And when asked, he should answer ‘ No.’

“ And people should say to him, ‘ But then, good friend, you are making a staircase to mount up into something—taking it for a mansion—which, all the while, you know not, neither have seen ! ’ And when so asked, he should answer ‘ Yes.’

“ And again, Vashisth, if this river, Asirvati, were full of water even to the brim and over-flowing ; and a man with business on the other side, bound for the other side, should come up and want to cross her. And he standing on this bank, should invoke the further bank, and say—‘ Come hither, O further bank ! come over to this side ! ’ Now what think you Vashisth ? Would the further bank by reason of that man’s invoking and praying and hoping and praising come over to this side ? ”

‘ Certainly not, Gautam ! ’

" In just the same way, Vashisth, do the Brahmans versed in the three Vedas—omitting the practice of those qualities which really make a man a Brahman, and adopting the practice of those qualities which really make men not Brahmans—say thus—' Indra we call upon you, Soma we call upon, Varun we call upon, Ishan we call upon, Prajapati we call upon, Brahm we call upon, Mahiddhi we call upon, Yajn we call upon you..... will they by their mere invoking, and praying and hoping and praising become united with Brahm ? ' "(1)

AVANT SUPERSTITION.

When the Blessed One was staying at the bamboo-grove near Rajgrah he once met on his way Srigal, a householder, who, clasping his hands, turned to the four quarters of the world, to the zenith above, and to the nadir below. And the Blessed One knowing that this was done according to the traditional religious superstition to avert evil, asked Srigal: ' Why are you performing these strange gyrations ? ' Srigal replied--' Do you think it strange that I should protect my home against the influence of demons ? I know that thou wouldst tell me that incantations are of no avail and possess no saving power. But listen to me and know, that in performing this rite I honour, reverence, and keep sacred the words of my father.'

Then the Tathagat said: ' You do well, O Srigal, to honour, reverence and keep sacred the words of your father ; and it is your duty to protect your home, your wife, your children, and the children of your children against the hurtful influences of evil spirits. I find no fault with the performance of your father's rite. But I find that you do not understand the ceremony. Let the Tathagat, who is speaking to you as a spiritual father and loves you not less than did your parents, explain to you the meaning of the six directions.'

(1) *Fevigga Sutta* I—35 ; 11 B. B. E. 167-180.

'To guard your home by mysterious ceremonies is not sufficient; you must guard it by good deeds. Turn to your parents in the East, to your teachers in the South, to your wife and children in the West, to your friends in the North, and regulate the zenith of your religious relations above you, and the nadir of your servants below you. Such is the religion your father wants you to have, and the performance of the ceremony shall remind you of your duties.'

And Srigal thanked the Blessed One and joined his Order.⁽¹⁾

AVOID EVIL.

There are evils (*Asuvās*)⁽²⁾ which should be abandoned, brethren, by insight; there are evils, which should be abandoned by subjugation; there are evils, which should be abandoned by right use; there are evils, which should be abandoned by avoidance; there are evils, which should be abandoned by removal; there are evils which should be abandoned by cultivation.

Those to be abandoned by insight: the unconverted man, who does not understand the true doctrine, nor is trained in it, who does not know what to consider and what not; e.g., the evil of lust, the evil of life, the evil of ignorance.

Things like the following, which it is unwise to think about: "Have I existed during the ages that are past, or have I not? What was I during the ages that are past? How was I during the ages that are past? Shall I exist during the ages of the future? or shall I not? What shall I be during the ages of the future?" or as to the present.

"Do I after all exist, or am I not? How am I? This is a being; whence now did it come, and whither will it go?"

Things which unwisely considered gives rise to the following (absurd) notions:—"As something true and real he

(1) *Sapt. Sutta* (Grimblot, Paris),
Cetus 122, 123.

(2) *Asuvās*—lit. "a running or flowing",
a "leak," evil, delinquent, fault, stain.

gets the notion—"I have a self" or "I have not a self," or "By myself I am conscious of myself" or "By myself I am conscious of my non-self."

"This soul of mine can be perceived, it has experienced the result of good and evil actions committed here and there: now this soul of mine is permanent, lasting, eternal, has the inherent quality of never-changing, and will continue for ever and ever!"

"This, brethren, is called the walking in delusion, the jungle of delusion, the wilderness of delusion, the puppet show of delusion, the writing of delusion, the fetter of delusion."

"One living in this delusion is never free from pain."

"And what are the things which he should consider, but does not?—the evil of lust, the evil of life and the evil of ignorance, all of which having sprung up, grow great. And what are the things which he should not consider and does?—the evil of lust, the evil of life; the evil of ignorance—all of which if they had not sprung up before, spring not up within him, and which had sprung up are put away."

"And what are the evils, which are to be abandoned by insight? This is suffering. This is the origin of suffering. This is the cessation of suffering. This is the way which leads to the cessation of suffering."

"And which are the evils to be abandoned by subjugation?—These: the subjugation of the organs of sight, of hearing, of smell, of taste, of touch, of mind."

"And which are the evils to be abandoned by right use? These: the use of robes to ward off cold, heat, mosquitoes and gad-flies, wind, sun and snakes and to cover his nakedness; the use of alms only to sustain the body in life, the use of abode to ward off cold and heat, etc., and to secure the delight of privacy, the use of medicine to ward off sickness, and to preserve his health."

"And which are the evils to be abandoned by endurance? These: patient endurance of cold, heat, hunger, thirst, mosquitoes, gad-flies, wind, sun, and snakes; abusive words, under bodily suffering, utter pain however sharp, rough, severe, unpleasant, disagreeable and destructive even to life. 'For whereas, brethren, to the man who endureth not, evils may arise, full of vexation and distress; to him who endures, the evils, full of vexation and distress are not.'

"And which, brethren, are the evils to be abandoned by avoidance? These: a rogue elephant, a furious horse, a wild bull, a mad dog, a snake, a stump in the path, a thorny bramble, a pit, a precipice, a dirty tank or pool, a place where one should not sit or walk, bad company.

"And which, brethren, are the evils to be abandoned by removal? These: a lustful thought, an angry thought, a malicious thought, some sinful wrong.

And which, brethren, are the evils to be abandoned by cultivation? These: search after Truth, Energy, Joy, Peace, Earnest Contemplation, Equanimity.

"And when a monk has done all this, he has rolled away every Fetter and he has made an end of Pain."⁽¹⁾

AVOID BRAHMANS.

"They live on the food provided by the faithful, continue addicted to injuring life, are addicted to storing up property, to witness public shows, theatrical representations, concerts, dancing and singing; employ their time in gambling, dicing, trapball, sketching rude figures, blowing trumpets, ploughing marches, tumbling, forming mimic windmills, sit and sleep on ornamental beds and carpets inwrought with gold and silk, adorn their person and anoint their bodies with fragrant perfumes, repeat tales of kings, of robbers, or of ministers of state, empty tales of things which are and which are not.

(1) *Sabbhasava Sutta*, 1-29; 11 S. E. E. 296-307.

" They wrangle and say, ' You are ignorant of this doctrine and discipline, but I understand them ! What do you know of doctrine or discipline ? ' ' You are heterodox, but I am orthodox ! ' ' My discourse is profitable, but yours is worthless ! ' ' That which you should speak first, you speak last, and that which you should speak last, you speak first.'

" They perform the servile duties of a go-between, continue addicted to hypocrisy.

" They continue to gain a livelihood by such low arts, by such lying practices as these,—that is to say, by divination, by marks on the body, by auguries, by the interpretation of prognostics, of dreams, and of omens, good or bad, by divination from the manner in which cloth and such other things have been bitten by rats, by sacrifices to the god of fire, offerings of *Dub* grass, offerings with a ladle, offerings of husks, of bran, of rice, of clarified butter, of oil, and liquids ejected from the mouth, and by bloody sacrifices, by teaching spells for preserving the body, for determining lucky sites for protecting the fields, for luck in war, against ghosts and goblins, to serve as antidotes for poison, and to cure bites of scorpion or rats, by divination by the flight of hawks, or by the croaking of crows, by guessing at the length of life, by teaching spells to ward off wounds, and by pretended knowledge of the language of beasts, by explaining the good and bad points of jewels, sticks, garments, swords, arrows, bows, weapons of war, women, men, youths, maidens, male and female slaves, elephants, horses, bulls, oxen, goats, sheep, fowls, snipes, iguanas, long-eared creatures, turtle and deer, by fore-telling future events, and the movements of the planets and their effect upon the fortunes of men as that ' The eclipse of the moon will have such and such a result. ' ' That there will be an abundant rainfall. ' ' There will be famine. ' ' There will be tranquillity. ' ' There will be disturbances. ' ' The season will be sickly. ' ' the season will be healthy. ' By giving advice touching the taking in marriage or the giving in marriage, the forming of alliances or the dissolution of connections, the calling in property, or the

laying of it out, by teaching spells to procure prosperity or to cause adversity to others, to remove sterility, to produce dumbness, locked-jaw, deformity, or deafness, by obtaining oracular responses by the aid of mirror, or from a young girl, or from a god, by worshipping the sun, or by worshipping Brahm, by spitting fire out of their mouths, or by laying hands on people's heads, by teaching the ritual for making vows and performing them, for blessing fields, for impairing virility and rendering impotent, for choosing the site of a house, for performing a house-warming, by teaching forms of words to be used when cleansing the mouths, when bathing, and when making offerings to the god of fire, by prescribing medicines to produce obstructions in the higher or lower intestines, or to relieve head-ache, by preparing oils for the ear, collyriums, catholious antimony, and cooling drinks, by practising cautery, midwifery or the use of root decoctions or salves."⁽¹⁾

UPROOT VICE.

In Kushal a great number of Brahmans and householders were seated together in a playhouse, as was their wont, to hold a chat. "Who are the beings," some one asked, "who will pass beyond birth and death?" A severe ascetic answered: "They who remain seated for a long time in one place."⁽²⁾ Another said: "They who make sacrifices and burn offerings." Then Bhagwat said: "We thank you, Brahmans and citizens; if a dense forest or thick jungle had caught fire and had (afterwards) been soaked by rain (and put out) would it grow again?" "Certainly, Venerable One." "And why so?" "Because the roots have not been destroyed." Well, so it is with those who practise severe asceticism, or who remain seated (motionless), passions will spring up afresh, because they have not completely destroyed attachment."⁽³⁾

(1) *Esuigga Sutta* Ch. II—1-10; (Pt. ■ II—1-7; 11 ■ B. E. 189-200.

seated motionless.

■ *Udānavaṃsa* (Trubner), 207.

(2) Penance by *Asen* i.e. by remaining

BUDDH'S DREAM.

The Great King of Glory possessed seven precious things and was gifted with four marvellous powers. On a Sabbath Day⁽¹⁾ having taken a bath and purified himself, he went up to the upper storey of his palace, when there appeared to him the heavenly Treasure of the Wheel⁽²⁾ with its nave, its tyre, and all its thousand spokes complete. He thought to himself. "He who sees this Wheel becomes an invincible King of Kings. May I, then, become a King of Kings invincible?"

He then reverently uncovered from one shoulder his robe, held in his left hand a pitcher, and with his right hand he sprinkled water on the Wheel saying—"Roll onward, O My Lord the Wheel! O My Lord go forth and overcome!"

The Wheel rolled eastwards, and after it, went the King of Glory with his army, and in whatever place the Wheel stopped the King stopped also. There all the rival kings in the regions of the East assembled and welcomed the King saying 'Come, O Mighty King! Welcome, O Mighty King! All thine, O Mighty King! Do thou, O Mighty King, be a Teacher to us!'

Then spake the Great King of Glory,

"Ye shall slay no living thing,

Ye shall not take that which has not been given.

Ye shall not act wrongly touching the bodily desires.

Ye shall speak no lie.

Ye shall drink no maddening drink.

Ye shall eat as ye have eaten.

They obeyed and became subjects of the Great King of Glory.

The wondrous Wheel having plunged into the great waters in the East, rose up again and rolled onwards to the region of the South and then of the West, and then of the North and there too all happened as had happened in the region of the East.

(1) *Uposath*—a weekly sacred day—Four days of a lunar month, being Full-moon day, New-moon day, and two equidistant intermediate days. *Maha* *Sudarshan Sutra* I—11; 11 S. B. E. 251 f.n. (2).

(2) *Chakra-ratnam*, where the *chakra* is the disc of the Sun.

This wondrous Wheel having thus conquered all the four corners of the compass, returned back to the royal city of Kushvati and remained fixed on the open terrace in front of the entrance to the inner apartment of the Great King of Glory as a glorious adornment.⁽¹⁾ Then, before the King of Glory appeared the jewel of an Elephant⁽²⁾ wondrous in power, flying through the sky—the Elephant-King whose name was Uposath.⁽³⁾ The King mounted it to test its wondrous feats, it passed over along the broad earth to its very ocean boundary, and then returned again in time for the morning meal to the Royal city of Kushvati.

Then appeared the jewel of a Horse which could fly through the sky. Its name was "Valhako" (Thunder-cloud). The King rode him, reached the extremity of the earth and was back home for his morning meal.

Then there appeared the best of Gems which lighted up the earth and sky, so that when he marched at the head of his army at night with the gem raised aloft upon his standard-top, the people would shout "The day-light hath appeared."

Then there appeared the glory of Woman graceful in figure, beautiful in appearance, charming in manner and of the finest complexion, of medium figure and height and complexion, never in thought unfaithful, who had attained even unto the beauty of a goddess; pleasant in speech and ever on the watch to hear what she could do to give the King pleasure.

Then there appeared the jewel of a Treasurer⁽⁴⁾ possessing marvellous power of vision by which he could discover treasure whether it had an owner or whether it had not. To test him the King took him in a boat in midstream of the river Ganges and asked him to produce yellow-gold. He reached down to the water and with both his hands he drew up a jar, full of yellow gold and asked the King "Is that enough?"

(1) *Maha Sudarshan Sutta* Ch. I—1—19;
11 ■ B. E. 247-254.

(2) *Hathi-ratna*.

(3) Name for the Buddhist Sabbath.

(4) *Grahpati Ratna*.

Then there appeared the jewel of an Adviser.

These were the seven precious gifts which the Great King of Glory received. But he had four more, namely, beauty of person, long life, health, and popularity with his subjects.

The Great King of Glory then thought that he might build lotus-ponds in the midst of the palms. He then built exquisite lotus-ponds faced with gold, silver, beryl and crystal, and in them he planted flowers of every season, made provision for the convenience of bathers, and made perpetual grant for food and drink and clothes and couches and wines for those who wanted them, gold and money for those in want.

Then the people brought to the King much wealth which the King refused, but the people would not take it back, so he invested it in building a palace of gold-bricks, and named it the Palace of Righteousness. Then he planted a grove of palm trees all of gold at the entrance to the chamber of the great complex. ⁽¹⁾

Then he built in front of the Palace of Righteousness a Lotus-Lake to bear the name of Righteousness.

Then occurred to the King the thought "Why I am so mighty and so great? Of what previous character now may this be the fruit, of what previous character the result?"

Then occurred to him the thought. "Of three qualities is this the fruit,—of charity, of self-conquest, and of self-control."

The King then ascended the steps of the Great complex and there standing, he broke out into a cry of great emotion :

" Stay here, O thoughts of lust !
 Stay here, O thoughts of ill-will !
 Stay here O thoughts of hatred !
 Thus far only, O thoughts of lust
 Thus far only, ■ thoughts of ill-will !
 Thus far only, O thoughts of hatred !"

(2) *Mahavyuhas.*

Then entering the chamber and seating himself upon the golden couch, his mind went through the four *Dhyans*—meditations—and then he passed his mind through the world with thoughts of Love, Pity, Sympathy and Equanimity, then he ordered his Advisors to send in the Royal Elephants not every evening as usual, but at stated times.

Now the Great Queen of Glory had not seen the Great King for a considerable time, so she ordered her chamber-maids to get ready to accompany her to the King. She arrived at his palace with all her retinue; but as soon as she reached the door the King said: "Stop there, O Queen, enter not!"

The King himself ordered his golden couch to be taken out of the chamber complex and laid under the palm tree where the King lay down. The Queen approached him and reminded him of his Glory, of his gold, his might and power, the innumerable army of retainers, attendants, palaces, gardens, elephants and chariots. But the King bade her not to address him any more in those pleasant phrases, but "now in this last time, speak in words unpleasant, disagreeable and not to be desired."

"How then, O King, shall I address thee?" she enquired.

"Say that I should pass away with no longing for this life or its good things."

She wept and repeated the words in which he had asked her to address him.

The Great King of Glory then passed away, and he came to life again in the happy world of Brahm.

"Now you may ask who was that Great King of Glory? Well, it was I who have appeared here before, seven times and this is now my eighth re-appearance and I die and behold!

"How transient are ■ component things!
Growth is their nature and decay;
They are produced and are dissolved again;
And then is best, when they have sunk to rest!" (1)

(1) *Maha Sudarshan Sutra*; Chh. I, II; 11 S. B. E. 247-289.

THE DONKEY IN LION'S SKIN.

Once upon a time while Brahm Dutt ruled in Benares, the future Buddha was born in a peasant family, and when he grew up, he lived by tillage.

Now at that time a pedlar moved from village to village, selling his goods which he carried on a donkey's back. As he reached a village his rule was to unload the goods, cover his donkey with a lion's skin and let him loose in the barley fields to graze, so that when the watchmen saw him grazing they dared not go near him mistaking him for a lion.

One day when the pedlar reached a village, and as was his wont he, turned his donkey loose in a barley field, the watchmen ran back to the village and told the villagers that a lion was eating up their barley. Thereupon all the villagers turned out weapons in hands, blowing conches and beating drums and as they approached the field, they raised a shout.

Terrified by the noise, the donkey lost his nerve and brayed. The villagers thereupon rushed up to the donkey and broke his bones by beating. They removed the lion's skin and bore it away. The pedlar then came and looking at his donkey in a bad plight exclaimed, "If only he had'n't brayed." And even when he so spake, the donkey died.⁽¹⁾

VAIN SEARCH.

Several rich young men went into a grove to enjoy themselves. They had all their wives except one who had taken a harlot for company. This harlot stole the articles belonging to the party and disappeared.

When the friends learnt of it, they started in search of the harlot; and as they found Gautam seated at the foot of a tree, they turned to him and asked him if he had seen the harlot; at which the Blessed One turning to the young men asked, "What have you to do, young men, with the woman?"

⁽¹⁾ *Jataka* V, VI. *Panch Wantra* IV-7; Copied in "*Jacop's Fables*"; (Murray) *Hitopadesh* III; *Katha Sarit Sagar* III.

They replied, "We were sporting in this grove; and as one of us had no wife, so we got her, the woman. But as we were indulging in our sports, she ran away. So we are out to find her."

"Now what think you, young men? Which would be better for you;—that you should go in search of a woman, or that you should go in search of yourselves?"

"That, Lord, would be better for us, that we should go in search of ourselves." "If so, young men, sit down, I will preach to you the Truth" ⁽¹⁾

LOVE FOR HATE.

And the Blessed One observed the ways of society and noticed how much came from malignity and foolish offences done only to gratify vanity and self-seeking pride.

And the Blessed One said: "If a man foolishly does me wrong, I will return to him the protection of my ungrudging love; the more evil comes from him, the more good shall go from me; the fragrance of goodness always comes to me and the harmful air of evil goes to him."

A foolish man learned that Buddha observed the principle of great love, which commands to return good for evil; he came and abused him. Buddha was silent, pitying his folly.

The man having finished his abuse, Buddha asked him saying: "Son, if a man declined to accept a present made to him, to whom would it belong?" And he answered: "In that case it would belong to the man who offered it." "My son," said Buddha, "you have railed at me, but I decline to accept your abuse, and request you to keep it yourself. Will it not be a source of misery to you? As the echo belongs to the sound; and the shadow to the substance, so misery will overtake the evil-doer without fail."

(1) *M.* V. 1-14; ■ *S.B.E.* 116, 117.

The abuser made no reply, and Buddha continued: "A wicked man who reproaches a virtuous one is like one who looks up and spits at heaven; the spittle spoils not the heaven, but comes back and defiles his own person.

"The slanderer is like one who flings dust at another when the wind is contrary; the dust returns on him who threw it. The virtuous man cannot be hurt, and the misery that the other would inflict comes back on himself."

The abuser went away abashed, but he returned and took refuge in the Buddha, the Dharma, the Law and the Sangha. ⁽¹⁾

THE PRODIGAL SON.

There was a house-holder and he had a son who left him. The house-holder made money, while the son lost what he had and became miserably poor. In his wanderings for food and clothing the son chanced to come to the town where his father lived. He saw him and taking pity on his wretchedness and poverty, he ordered some of his servants to call him. The son got frightened and ran away. The father sent his servants again with instructions to deal with him tenderly and he got him employed by a labourer of his own rank and education, so the son did not feel awkward to serve him. The father watched his career from the window of his house, and when he saw that he was honest and industrious, he had him promoted higher and higher.

After many years he summoned his son; called together all his servants and made the secret known to them. Then the son was overjoyed to meet his father. The father trained his son little by little to succeed to him and he then endowed him with all his riches. ⁽²⁾

(1) *Sūtra of Forty-two sections* (Kyoto, *Udanavarg* (Trübner) 208, 209.
Japan Carus—LVII. 145, 146, (2) "*Lotus*" Ch. IV.

THE TYRANT'S TALE.

There was a great king who oppressed his people and was hated by them; yet when Buddha came into his kingdom, the king was anxious to see him. So he went to see him. The king said to him "O Shakyamuni, can you teach a lesson to the king that might be both interesting and profitable?"

"Yes," replied Gautam, "I shall tell you a story."

"Once upon a time there lived a wicked tyrant whom the god Indra wished to teach a lesson. So he assumed the form of a hunter and taking the demon Matali with him descended to the earth. He made Matali assume the form of a hungry dog of an enormous size. The two together entered the palace and the dog barked so violently that it shook the very foundation of the palace. The king thereupon sent for the hunter and asked him why the dog was making such deafening noise. The hunter said: "The dog is hungry." Whereupon the frightened king ordered food for him. He ate up all and was still barking, when the king ordered all the food prepared for the royal banquet to be given to him. He ate it up and resumed his barking ever as before. More food was given to him, till the royal granaries were empty; but the dog's hunger was unappeased. Then the tyrant grew desperate and asked the hunter "Will nothing save the cravings of that wild beast?" "Nothing," replied the hunter, "nothing, except perhaps the flesh of all his enemies." "And who are his enemies?" enquired the tyrant. "Those who keep the people in the kingdom hungry. So long as they are hungry the dog will be hungry too." The oppressor of the people understood and for the first time began to listen to the teachings of righteousness.

Having ended his story, the Blessed One addressed the king who had turned pale, and said to him:

"The Thathagat can quicken the ears of the powerful, and when thou, great king, hearest the dog bark, you may still learn to pacify the monster." (1)

(1) *Jataka Tales.*

THE BITER BITTEN.

A tailor who used to make robes for the brotherhood was given to cheating and prided himself upon his cleverness. But once having to deal with a customer he was himself cheated and ruined. And the Blessed One said: "Hear the story of the tailor as he was in his previous life. This man was then a crane and he lived near a pond which was getting dry in the hot weather. So he went up to the fish therein and said "Don't you see the tank is drying up and you are going to die. Why don't you move to the beautiful lake yonder which never dries up?" "How can we reach there, we cannot fly?" cried the fish piteously. "Oh! if that is your difficulty" said the crane, "I can assist you. I shall take you one by one in my beak and throw you into the lake." But the fish thought to themselves, "What if the crane instead of dropping us into the lake, drop us down into his stomach?" The crane understood their fears and proposed to them to give him a trial, and if he could take and bring back a fish in his beak, then they should trust him, otherwise not. The fish agreed and one big carp decided to offer himself for the test. The crane gently held him in his beak, took him to the lake and showed him its fine water, after which he flew back to the pond and he assured the fish that it was all right, whereupon the fish all agreed to let the crane take them to the lake, which he did; but before dropping them into the lake, he dropped them into his own stomach, near a big Varan tree. Having finished with the fish, he next approached a lobster and proposed to take him safely to the lake. But the lobster said, "I am too big for your beak and you will drop me, if you carried me there." The fact is the lobster had fixed up a ruse of his own. He had said to himself: "I shall ask him to let me cling to his neck. If he dropped me in the lake it would be splendid, but if he didn't I could take my revenge." So he said, "Look here, friend, you cannot carry me in your beak, but we lobsters have a famous grip." If you let me cling to your neck with my claws I shall be glad to go with you." And the crane not seeing that the lobster was trying to outwit him, agreed. ■ the lobster

safely clung himself to the crane's neck and then called out, "Off with you now."

The crane flew with him to the lake and then turned off towards the Varan tree. "My dear uncle," cried the lobster, "the lake lies that way and you are taking me away from it." "Do you think so?" jested the crane, "am I your dear uncle? I suppose I am your slave to carry you about wherever you please. Now have a look at that heap of fish bones at the foot of that yonder Varan tree. Just as I have eaten them, I intend to eat you as well."

"Oh will you?" quoth the lobster, "then I had better be more careful" and so saying he gave the crane's neck a grip with his claws as with a vice.

Then the crane with tears in his eyes cried to him for mercy. "Oh My Lord, I did not intend to eat you. Grant me my life!"

"Very well! take me first to the lake." And the crane took him as fast as he could fly. And as he lay him down on the mud at its edge, the lobster gave a twist which severed the crane's neck as with a hunting knife.

Then added the Tathagat "Now this tailor was not only outwitted in this life, but in his past life too, and in the same way." (1)

ANCIENT DIOGENES.

There was a Brahman in Kaushambi, a disputant and well-versed in the three Vedas. As he regarded no one as equal to him in debate, he carried about all day a lighted torch in his hand, and when asked for the reason of his strange conduct, he would reply "The world is so dark that I carry this torch to light it up as far as I can."

A Shraman sitting in the market-place heard these words and told him: "My friend, your eyes are blind to the omnipotent rays of the sun, do not call the world dark. Your torch cannot add to its lightness. It only adds to your arrogance."

(1) *Jataka Tales*, 215.

On this the Brahman asked, "Where is the sun of which thou speakest?"

The Shraman said: "The wisdom of the Tathagat is the sun of the soul. His radiance illumines both by day and night and he who has faith will not lack light on the path to Nirvan where he will inherit bliss everlasting. (1)

THE BURNING MANSION.

There was a wealthy householder who possessed a large mansion. One day it caught fire. The householder ran out of the house and saw that his roof was on fire.

The children were all inside. He said to himself; "What shall I do if I go in to rescue them? They will run away, and while I am saving some, the rest might perish in the flames." Suddenly an idea struck him. "My children love toys—if I tempt them with toys they will all run out to see them." So he shouted, "Children, here are some toys for you more beautiful than you have ever seen. Run up quickly before it is too late." And lo! from the blazing ruins the children rushed out in full haste. The father bought them costly play-things and when they saw their house in flames they praised the resourcefulness of their father, which had saved their lives.

THE TALKATIVE TORTOISE.

In one of his previous births Buddha was born in a minister's family and when he grew up, he himself became the King's minister. He found the King too talkative and so he told him the following story: "Once upon a time" he said, "there lived a tortoise in a pond in the Himalaya mountains in which there came two swans, who became very friendly with him. They told him that there was a golden cave on Mount Beautiful in the Himalaya mountain, and proposed that all the three should visit it."

(1) Beal's *Chinese Dhammapad* 46.

"But how can I get there" asked the tortoise. "Easily, by hanging on to a stick with your teeth: we will hold it at each end and carry you. But you must hold your tongue." "O! I can easily do that," said the tortoise, "take me with you."

The swans then brought a twig and the tortoise got hold of it and the swans flew.

As they passed over a village, the villagers shouted "Look, two geese carrying a tortoise dangling on a stick!"

At this the tortoise could not bear the slight. He retorted: "What is it to you, you slaves! if the swans choose to be my carriers?" Having lost grip of the stick, the tortoise fell into the court-yard of a king, broken into two pieces. The king sent for the minister and asked him to explain the mystery.

The minister told him how it came about. The king then asked the minister. "Would he have been saved, if only he hadn't talked?" "Truly, king," spake the minister, "so if people will only hold their tongue, when they should be silent, they wouldn't come to grief."⁽¹⁾

THE JACKAL AND THE CROW.

Once upon a time a jackal saw a crow sitting on the branch of a Jambu tree and eating the Jambu fruit.

"Ha!" thought he, "I'll flatter him and get him to give me some of those Jambus to eat." So he said, "Who is this whose rich and pleasant notes proclaim him the best of all the singing birds, warbling so sweetly on the Jambu branch where he, like a peacock, sits firm and grand?"

The crow was flattered and replied, "Who is that so well-bred, whose shape and glossy coat reveals him a tiger's cub? Eat of these, I pray."

(1) *Jacok* (Fanshok) No. 215; taken in *Phaedrus* II-7; VII-14; *Aesop's Fables* and numerous other books.

He shook the branch and down fell ripe Jambu fruit which the jackal ate.

Seeing these two flatterers, the fairy of the tree exclaimed "Too long have I borne the sight of the refuse-eater and the offal-eater blinding each other: begone."⁽¹⁾

BUDDH'S JUSTICE.

A woman had bathed her child and laid it on the bank of a tank into which the mother entered to bathe herself. A woman vampire seeing the child, felt a craving to eat it. So she asked the mother if she might nurse her beautiful child. The mother agreeing, the vampire took the child and ran off with it. Seeing this the mother ran after the vampire, but the latter said that the child was hers. So quarrelling, they passed the door of the Bodhisatv who asked them to stop. He asked them what they were quarrelling about. Each told him that the other was claiming her child. "Very well" asked the Bodhisatv, "will you submit to my judgment?" They agreed. He then drew a line and laid the child midway upon it.

He then told the vampire to lay hold of its hands and the mother its legs and asked each to pull it, adding: "The child shall be hers who drags him over the line."

Then each pulled; but as the child began to cry through pain, the mother let it go as she could not bear its pain.

The Bodhisatv said, "Take the child, it is yours." He then asked the vampire why she wanted the child: "To eat it," she replied: "I am a vampire."

The mother blessed the Bodhisatv, and took away her child.⁽²⁾

(1) *Jataka* (Fanehall) No. 294 copied in *Æsop's Fables*.

(2) *Jataka* (Fanehall) 546; This is

probably a much older story and occurs in the *Book of Kings*

CHAPTER XVII

BUDDHISM AND OTHER FAITHS.

Buddhism is a child of Hinduism, of which it became a sect and afterwards a serious rival. Even as a sect, it differed from it upon its essential tenets—Brahmanism, idolatry, caste, sacrifice and its theory of final deliverance. And yet Buddhism borrowed and adapted its form and method, coquetted with its philosophy and assumed its dogmas in explanation of its own tenets. It battled with Hinduism during its infancy; but as the two became more developed and better organized, Hinduism first weakened its rival by loving embraces and then drove it out of its home by the combined use of force, chicanery and sophistry.

But when Buddh preached his gospel, he was uncompromising in his onslaught on Hinduism. He denounced the sacerdotal pretensions of the Brahman, denied his mediatorship, ridiculed his gods and reviled his philosophy. He had always opposed the pretensions of the caste and its right to determine social inequality. He equally opposed the discrimination between sexes which the Brahmans had heightened into an article of faith; while Buddh would probably have never founded his religion, if he had not to preach to his disciples the futility of sacrifices, penances and self-mortification as the main avenues to salvation. He was, however, by no means prepared at any time to antagonize their philosophy; though speaking for himself, he could see that the Hindu leap from the known to the unknown was only a dogma, which even as a dogma he could not unquestionably accept. While, therefore, he was opposed to the cardinal tenets of Hinduism, he had nonetheless launched his creed under its ægis, just as before him Kapil and Ajit had started their dissenting crusade against the authority of the Vedantic dogma. But his apostacy was in reality far more deep-rooted than the metaphysical subtleties of the founders of the Sankhya and Nastik systems of philosophy. For, while they attacked the Brahmanical speculation, they did not attack

Brahmanism; and while they attacked the theory, they did not oppose the practice of their faith. In other words, while they dug open one artery of Hinduism, they did not care to attack it through its main artery. Buddh, on the other hand, had seized and cut open its main artery with the result that Hinduism fell at his feet moribund and unconscious.

Only a cursory glance at the contemporary records is necessary to give one a faithful picture of the social habits of the time. That the Aryan settlers were addicted to gambling and drinking is only too apparent from the description of the public gaming houses⁽¹⁾ and the offering of the spirituous libations to the gods.⁽²⁾ The adulation of the Som Juice which yielded a highly intoxicating spirit is adulated in the Rig Veda and is the theme of an entire Veda, the Sama Veda, while frequent references to it occur in all the other Vedas.⁽³⁾ It is offered to the gods. That the Aryan killed cows⁽⁴⁾ and horses⁽⁵⁾ for food and that fatted calf was a delicacy and offered to an honoured guest is equally apparent.

The respect for cows appears to have grown only in the mediæval age. Even in the Mitakshara composed in the 11th century A.D. its desuetude is assumed to be comparatively recent to so as furnish the author with an apt illustration.⁽⁶⁾

(1) *Rigveda* X—34 (describes the woes of the ruined gambler) *Mahabharat* III—59-61 (story of Nala who lost his kingdom as a stake in a game with his brother. He went into exile with his devoted wife *Damayanti*).

Mrichchhakatik, drama of King Sudrak (2nd Act describes the gamblers' quarrels).

(2) 2 *Rig-Veda* (Wilson's Tr.) p. 204; *Ramayn* III, (Bharadwaj entertained Bharat, brother of Rama to liquor); *Mahabharat*, (Adi Parva) Arjun regales himself with spirituous liquor on the Raivat mountain); *Paitsirîya Sankhita* (1st part).

(3) 1. *Rig-Veda*, I-I—2 : I-II—4. "The chanters of the *Sama* extol Indra with songs, the reciters of the *Rick* with prayers; the priests of the *Yajus* with texts." (Wilson's Tr. p. 8) *Ib.* I-xiv—9 "Soma" deified (Wilson pp. 139, 140); IV-iv—2.

(4) *Manu* III—119, 120; V—35, 41, 42; Gour's *Hindu Code* (3rd Ed.) Introduction—Para. 67; *Charak* (Ch. on Food and drinks; says beef should not be eaten

daily); *Paitsirîya Brahman* II—65; (enumerates 180 animals including cows as fit for sacrifice) *Krishna Yajur Veda* III-ch. VIII (describes the varieties of cows as fit sacrifices to different gods (i.e.g., a draught bull is a fit offering to Vishnu; and a thick-legged cow to Indra.

(5) *Rig-Veda* I—21; 6; II—12.

(6) *Mitakshara* I—III-4. "The question is thus answered: True, this unequal partition is found in the sacred ordinances; but it must not be practised, because it is abhorred by the world; since that is forbidden by the maxim 'Practise not that which is legal but is abhorred by the world, for it secures not celestial bliss;' as the practice of offering bulls is shunned on account of popular prejudice, notwithstanding the injunction 'Offer to a venerable priest a bull or a large goat'; and as the slaying of a cow is for the same reason disused, notwithstanding the precept 'Slay a barren cow as a victim consecrated to Mitra and Varuna'."

The family life was patriarchal in which the wives and children were accounted as chattels, and the former as the sole machinery for procreation. The Ashvamedh sacrifice hallowed by age, had at first for its objective the attainment of wealth and prosperity, to which was soon added fecundity to secure which the queen herself had to lie all night in closest contact with the dead steed. ⁽¹⁾ The spirituallife had ceased to count ; since salvation could be obtained by the vicarious means of sacrifice and the meditation of Brahmins. Sound symbolised by the *Mantras* had acquired a greater potency than deeds. It wrought miracles, charmed the gods, exorcised the evil spirits, cured ailments and brought under control the Cosmic energy. Caste had become sufficiently crystallised to clip the wings of individual ambition. It sufficed to keep each man in his place. It thwarted the economic law of competition and incidentally acted as a soporific to social development. It had given hostages to any concerted movement for the amelioration of social order which was divinely ordained, interference with which was regarded as intolerable sacrilege. It was against this human inertness brought about by the concurrence of circumstances, that Buddhism took up the cudgels. It was a movement as thoroughly revolutionary as cataclysmic in its outlook and range as has ever stirred any people in the history of mankind. And it was all the work of a single man.

But that was neither his primary, nor even his main purpose. He never adverted to the social side of Hinduism and he did not intend to root out its social evils ; for, Buddh was not a social reformer. The fact is that social reform of the people amongst whom he lived never entered his thoughts, nor was he a conscious feminist. To him, life was a suffering irremediable, otherwise than by the means of deliverance he had given. To him, the perpetuation of society by adding to its amenities would itself have been an intolerable wrong, since it would have led to the prolongation of human suffering. Buddh was, therefore, an anti-socialist : To him—" All created things are grief and pain, he who knows and sees this, becomes passive in pain : this is the

(1) *Yajur Veda* 22, 26 ; See 2 Wilson's *Rig Veda* Introduction p. viii.

way that leads to purity.”⁽¹⁾ To him, the life he loved was not the life of a householder, but that of a Bhikkhu ; but, unlike the Hindu ascetic, he did not want his monks to lead the lives of social recluses. On the other hand, being the missionary torch-bearers of his faith, it was their duty to educate the masses and teach them the cardinal principles of his creed. The Buddhists thus became the pioneers of mass education and their disciples were the founders of two great universities as far apart as Nalanda and Taxila and the disseminators of learning through their numerous monasteries and preachers who scoured the country to propagate the gospel and popularize its tenets.

Buddh had, of course, no innate prejudice against Brahmans because they were Brahmans. He eulogized Brahmans of the earlier age who had preached chastity and virtue, rectitude, mildness, penance, tenderness, compassion and patience. “ Having asked for rice, beds, garments, butter and oil, and gathered them justly, they made sacrifices out of them, and when the sacrifice came on, they did not kill cows.”⁽²⁾ “ But there was a change in them ; after gradually seeing the King’s prosperity and adorned women, well-made chariots drawn by noble horses, carpets in variegated colours, palaces and houses divided into compartments and measured out : the great human wealth, attended with a number of cows, and combined with a flock of beautiful women, the Brahmans became covetous and then the King, the Lord of chariots, instructed by the Brahmans..... made sacrifices and having offered these sacrifices, he gave the Brahmans wealth, cows, beds, garments, and adorned women and well-made chariots drawn by noble horses, carpets in variegated colours, beautiful palaces, well-divided into compartments, and having filled these with different (sorts of) corns, he gave this wealth to the Brahmans ; and they, having thus received wealth, wished for a store, and the craving of those who had given way to (their) wishes increased still more ; they then, in this matter, having composed hymns, sent again to Okkhak, and said, “ As water, earth, gold, wealth, and corn, even so are these cows for men, for this is a requisite for

(1) *Dham.* XX-278 ; 10 S.B.E. 69.

(2) *Kulavagga* 12 ; 10 S. B. E., (Pt. 2) 48.

living beings ; sacrifice, (for) great is thy wealth.”⁽¹⁾ And the King sacrificed cows, and so Dhamm was lost, and the Brahmans became degraded. In this discourse Buddha shows how the Brahmans began well, but eventually yielded to cupidity and how they became mercenary and by inventing sacrifices were feathering their own nests at the expense of their wealthy patrons, whom they professed to offer salvation in return for their munificent gifts in the guise of sacrifices. He took a warning from their mis-deeds and therefore, provided for the strictest life of penury and poverty for his disciples.

But it was not the only point of difference with the Brahmans. In their selfish greed, they had become a closed corporation and created caste, thereby undermining the very roots of social equality and social fair-play. Buddha became, therefore, opposed to their institution of caste.

“Who is a Brahman?” he was asked. And he said: “A man does not become a Brahman by his plaited hair, by his family or by birth ; in whom there is truth and righteousness, he is blessed, he is a Brahman.”⁽²⁾ A Brahman is a degree, not a caste ; a status and not a birth-right. It depends upon his virtue and his deeds and not upon his observance of ceremonials or calling. Buddha had always appealed to man’s reason. He would not permit his disciples to take anything for granted, because it was given to them on high authority, even his own, though of course they never questioned it. But the fact remains that he was wholly opposed to the *ipse dixit* of the laity by enslaving their mind, by denying them the right to study the scriptures and then indoctrinating them in their all pervading dogmas, so that they were unable to move without consulting the omens and obtaining auspicious signs from the Brahmans. It is they who held the mainsprings of their daily lives—whether they were to marry, whom to marry, when to marry, what to eat and what to avoid, when to travel and when to touch, in fact, no act or movement of theirs could be performed nor any work however trivial undertaken without the guidance of the Brahmans.

(1) *Kulvagga* 10-26 ; 10 S. B. E. (2) *Dhamm* XXVI—393 ; 10. S. B. E. 91.
(Pt. 2). 49, 50.

This life-long shackling of one's life to the auguries of the priestcraft makes the life of a Hindu one of continuous suspense, dread and suffering. It is against this that Buddhism had first launched its main attack. The Brahmans had created a monopoly of their own caste. Buddha destroyed that monopoly. The Brahmans had denied that any one except them were privileged to read the sacred books. Buddha denied their right and told his disciples that their most sacred scriptures were inscribed on their own brains and that there could be no monopoly in the holy writ. The Brahmans had peopled the universe with gods and demons—the latter preponderating. Men, according to them, were the sport of these evil spirits and the only means of escaping their evil influence was through the good offices of the Brahmans. Buddha denied that he was subject to any superior force outside his own self. He asseverated that his destiny, immediate and future, lay in his own hands. And he thus freed men from the demoralizing fear of imaginary ghosts and goblins which had imbued their lives with an all-pervading uncertainty, trembling and fear, which is the root cause of the debasing pessimism of Indian philosophy.

To Buddha, therefore, India, and indeed the world, was indebted for the first rise of rationalism as a protest against the superstitions of religion. It is he, who emancipated man from the thralldom of the priest. It is he, who first showed him the way to free himself from the toils of sanctimonious hypocrisy and the sanc-cullotes of religion. To the Brahmans no religion was higher than the religion of sacrifice to the gods; to him no religion could be more humiliating to the gods or degrading to man. A sacrifice is nothing more than bribery, and salvation won by bribery and corruption is not a salvation which any self-respecting man would care to get. And this was the be-all and the end-all of Brahmanical Hinduism.

But in this respect Buddha fought against sacerdotism, but not Hinduism, with the philosophy of which he had much sympathy, though he was not able to agree with its arch keynote of a supreme Brahm from which all things emanated and

into which they finally returned. He was not equally sure that the world was a delusion (a *Maya*) and that nothing existed beyond the dream of the dreamer. The Hindu system was deductive, his own method was inductive. The Hindu argued from cause to the effect; Buddha proceeded in the inverse order and desired to proceed from the known to the unknown. Both lines of ratiocination have their faults—the one created pre-conception; the other takes you to the blind wall. Buddha preferred the blind wall to a pre-conception. He was himself unable to answer such questions: Is life eternal? Is the world eternal? Had it a beginning? Has it an end? He regarded these questions as beyond his ken and he evaded the inquirer's curiosity by limiting them to the unknown; but in so doing, he escaped from the Scylla of the Brahms, but fell into the Charibdis of his own Nirvan, which he could not reconcile with eternity, but without which it ceased to have any meaning. It is more than probable, that an acute thinker as he was, he had come to the logical end of his own induction, which he must have explained to his select disciples; but to the generality of them, he did not convey his disquieting conclusions.

That Buddhism had both an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine is now admitted on all hands. The latter had for its text book the work known as *Sattharm Pundarik* (or "The Great Lotus of the Good Law") which, though exoteric in form, contains an undercurrent of esotericism which only those who have graduated in the outer school are intellectually equipped to understand.

It was not long, however, before these lacunæ of his system were made good by his later disciples, who assimilated their own system to that of the Brahmins, from whom they bodily borrowed their whole system of ontology; and the later Buddhists even transformed their symbolism by adapting it to their own creed. In this way the *Yoge* of Bramhanism became the *Dhyan* of Buddhism, and the latter, like the former, were held to lead to the acquisition of supernatural powers and the performance of miracles which were imputed to Buddha, when it became necessary to bolster up his divinity against the attractions of the Hindu pantheon. It does not appear that

these developments of the newer system were the work of a day or of a century. They appear to have been slowly and gradually engrafted upon older Buddhism under the pressure of successive waves of revivalism.

In order to give a verisimilitude of immortality to the concept of Nirvan, the existence of a supreme Brahm and a heaven appears to have become necessary even in Buddh's own life-time and if he did not accept that notion, he certainly did nothing to discourage it. Moreover, he had himself to accept the Upanishad-system of epistemology by ascribing to intuition the source of true knowledge. His "name and form" in the doctrine of causation is nothing more than the "*Nam-rup*" of Brahmanical philosophy intended to denote spirit and matter combined in an individual. Nor can his chain of causation be complete without the two additional Brahmanical links of *karm* and metempsychosis. Even in his own chain, the root cause of causation being Ignorance, it is said to produce *Sanskar* or action. Now this term is borrowed from the Sankhya system of philosophy, according to which ignorance produces dispositions on the inner organ reproduced in future life. But he was not a docile disciple of Kapil and did not accept his irreconcilable assumptions as to matter and spirit, though he accepted his conception of the constant process of Nature as ruled by causality. Further he was not prepared to go. For instance, he could not subscribe to the Sankhya doctrine of nature as an ultimate reality, whence evolution takes place; nor of its *Guns* or constituents of being; nor could he concede to the Sankhya the assumption that the whole process of evolution of nature is unconscious save through reflection or other contact with spirit. But whatever be his indebtedness both to the *Yoge* or Kapil's system of cosmology, the one outstanding fact by which Buddhism was able to survive the cold intellectualism of those systems was the superiority of its ethical system, which received the personal stimulus from its founder's example.

The question how far Buddh borrowed from or conceded to the tenets of Jainism can be easily answered. That religion,

like his own, was the product of that intellectual ferment which has made Buddha's age so conspicuous in the religious thought of the world. The history of the founders of Confucianism and Taoism in China has already been given.⁽¹⁾ It remains to refer to Jainism as an off-shoot of the ancient system from which Buddhism itself was evolved. Like Buddha, Mahavir a kinsman of Buddha's, the founder of Jainism, denied the divine origin and infallibility of the Vedas; and like him, he held that certain saints have, by a life of purity and penance, attained not only to an equality with, but even superiority over, the Hindu divinities. He likewise held to the doctrines of *karm* and the transmigration, and consequently showed excessive regard for all forms of animal life. The word Jain is derived from *Jin*—which means "victor" and the Jains believe in the *Jins* or saints who have won over all human passions and infirmities and have thus become exalted to the status of gods. These are limited to 72 of whom 24 Tirthankars (or deified mortals) belong to the past age, 24 to the present age, while the remaining 24 have still to appear. Mahavir was the twenty-fourth; and, therefore, the last of the present race of saints, while his immediate predecessor was Parasnath whose creed Mahavir professed to revive and expound. All these saints are worshipped under various honorific titles such as *Jagatprabhu* (or Lord of the world), *Kshin-karm* (or "free from ceremonial acts"), *Adishwars* ("Supreme Lords"), *Devadhidēvas* ("gods of gods"), *Tirthankars* ("Those who have crossed the sea of life") and *Jins* (or "victors"). Of the twenty-four deified saints, there is reason to hold that only Parasnath and Mahavir were historical personages, their predecessors being mythical and said to have lived for millions of years. Life is subject to innumerable re-incarnations, but after purification, as in the Buddhist system, it finally reposes in *Nirvan*, which is not annihilation on the one hand, nor absorption in the Brahm on the other, but a mere unceasing apathy producing supreme felicity. So far they and the Buddhists are at one.

(1) p.p. 225-261 ante ch. XI.

But the Jains differ from them in two important respects—namely, they postulate the existence of Soul not only in man but in all living creatures; and secondly, they regard their goal of Nirvan attainable as much by the practice of mortification, as by the acquisition of knowledge. And it is on this vital subject of mortification that Jainism joined issue with Buddhism, and it is on that ground that Dev Dutt, when he joined hands with the Jains to chastise Buddha and his disciples, denounced them as easy-going pleasure-loving divines.

Buddha had, therefore, to withstand the dual attack from the Hindus and the Jains when he denounced self-mortification as the avenue to salvation.

It appears that Jainism was at one time a serious menace to Buddhism. It had no philosophic system of its own and the system it compiled does not call for serious notice. The Jains divided all existence into Jiv and Ajiv, that is life and not-life. The former are of two kinds; those that move, and those that cannot. To the class of moving Jivs belong men, animals, demons and gods. All these are subject to the law of *Karm*: their future lives will be higher or lower according to the quality of their actions in this life. This doctrine coincides with that of Hinduism and from this both Buddha and Mahavir had evidently received their inspiration.

The second division of existence is *Ajiv* (or non-living) which includes, time, space and religion. Religious merit determines the course of virtue and *Pap* (sin), of which there are 1,082 and mostly comprise non-observance of caste-rules. The objective of all sentient life is *Moksh* or Salvation, and this, as already stated, is attained in Nirvan.

All human passions flow from the organs of sense (*Asran*); while man is endowed with *Samvar* or a power by which acts are aided or hindered, *e.g.*, attention, secrecy, patience, asceticism and the like; while *Bandh* ("union") is the life in union which acts, (*Karm*) as milk with water—the final purpose of life being attained by *Moksh* (Salvation) which is the liberation of the vital spirit from the bonds of action causing cessation

from re-births and the final repose of the soul in eternal Nirvan already described.

The Jains are now divided into two rival sects, the Digambar⁽¹⁾ (or "space or sky-clad") and Shwetambar⁽²⁾ (or white-robed). The former are the older sect and their most outstanding peculiarity was that they went about absolutely naked, believing in the sanctity of nakedness or as typifying their freedom from all earthly ties and consequent re-birth. Megasthenes said that the Jains were going about naked and so described them as Gymnosophists (or the naked friars). They were then called "*Niganths*" (or "free from bonds") and are so referred to both in the Hindu and Buddhist scriptures.

Professor Jacobi, the highest authority on Jainism, thus compares it to Buddhism: "Mahavir was rather of the ordinary class of religious men in India. He may be allowed a talent for religious matters, but he possessed not the genius which Buddha undoubtedly had. The Buddha's philosophy forms a system based on a few fundamental ideas, whilst that of Mahavir scarcely forms a system, but is merely a sum of opinions on various subjects, no fundamental ideas being there to uphold the mass of metaphorical matter. Besides this,.....it is the ethical element, that gives to the Buddhist writings their superiority over those of the Jains. Mahavir treated ethics as corollary and subordinate to his metaphysics with which he was chiefly concerned." And it is the inherent defect of Hinduism which it shared with its god-child.

Besides these two ancient faiths, Buddhism had in its inception to encounter no other opposition. There were a few animists with their abode in the forests, whom Buddha successfully reclaimed; and for six hundred years till the advent of Christianity, it was the only missionary religion which held sway in the then great Empires of Asia.

It appears to have materially influenced the thought of eastern Europe. The communication between the two continents in those days was more intimate than is ordinarily

(1) *Dig*—universe, sky; *Ambar*—clothes. ■ *Shwet*—white, *Ambar*—clothes.

believed; and Buddhist doctrines are known to have deeply affected religious thought in Alexandria and Palestine; and it is still a question how far the Buddhist ideal of the holy life, with its monks, nuns, relic-worship, bells, and rosaries, confessional practice and its ritual, influenced Christian monachism, and to what extent Buddhist philosophy aided the development of the Gnostic heresies, particularly those of Basilides and Manes, which rent the early Church. "It is certain that the analogies are striking, and have been pointed out alike by Jesuit missionaries in Asia, and by Oriental scholars in Europe. The form of adjuration for those who renounced the Gnostic doctrines of Manes, expressly mentions **Buddh** and the Scythian or Shakyas. At this moment, the Chinese in San Francisco assist their devotions by the pictures of the Buddhist goddess of mercy imported on thin paper from Canton, which the Irish Roman Catholics identify as the Virgin Mary with the infant in her arms, with an aureole round her head, an adoring figure at her feet, and the spirit hovering in the form of a bird". (1) "It is difficult to enter a Japanese Buddhist temple without being struck by analogies to the Christian ritual on the one hand, and to Hinduism on the other. The chantings of the priests, their bowing as they pass the altar, their vestments, rosaries, bells, incense, and the responses of the worshippers remind one of the Christian ritual."

"The temple at Rokugo," writes a recent traveller in a remote town in Japan, "was very beautiful, and except that its ornaments were superior in solidity and good taste, it differed little from a Romish church. The low altar, on which were lilies and lighted candles, was draped in blue and silver; and on the high altar, draped in crimson and cloth of gold, there was nothing but a closed shrine, an incense-burner and a vase of lotuses. (2)

In a Buddhist temple, the Chinese goddess of Mercy, Kwan-yin, whose resemblance to Virgin Mary and child has already been mentioned, is seen standing on a serpent, bruising his head

(1) *Web. Hist. Ind. Lit.* 309 note; 363; 295; quoted in Hunter's *Indian Empire* Hunter: *Indian Empire* 195. 195.

(2) *Miss Bird's Unbeaten Tracks in Japan*,

with her heel.”⁽¹⁾ The intimate connection of Persia and Greece with Western India is amply supported by historical records. The Greek connection with India began in 600 B.C. when the Greek mariners used to enter the mouth of the Indus with a view to discover its source. Scylax of Caryanda, a Greek Sea Captain, was employed by King Darius (522-486 B.C.) to explore the course of the Indus. ⁽²⁾ He wrote a book from which Aristotle quoted the statement that among the Indians the kings were held to be of a superior race to their subjects. ⁽³⁾ His book otherwise records wild travellers’ tales. Hecatocus of Miletus wrote a work before 500 B.C. in which he refers to Gandhars and the Indus; a few years later Herodotus wrote his History and borrowed from Hecatocus his description of the course of the Indus. About this time, the peacock was introduced from India into Greece *via* Babylon mentioned in that connection in the Buddhist Jaatak ⁽⁴⁾, while Homer mentions its tin, and other writers, its ivory. Ctesias of Cridus, a Greek physician resided for seventeen years at the Court Physician in Persia (415-397 B.C.); his account of India rivals in marvel that given by Scylax and gave the Greeks an impression that India was a land of hideous monsters and strange poisons, though it abounded in gold and gems ⁽⁵⁾.

But the wide gates of truer knowledge were flung open with the influx of the Greeks who accompanied Alexander’s army, which was as much an expedition of research as of conquest. There is no reliable evidence on record to show whether these Greek adventurers took any interest in the religion and ethnology of India; but we have the best evidence of the invasion of Alexander who delivered his attack on the Raja of Taxilla. The gates of this city were thrown open to the army of Alexander and the people crowded to see the strange faces and garbs of the Yavanas. Alexander was accompanied by several philosophers and historiographers, amongst them

(1) Sir C. Eliot’s 3 *Hinduism and Buddhism* 435 f. n. (1); J. E. Harrison, *Proleg. ■ the study of Greek Religion* XI and App.

(2) *Herodotus* IV—44.

(3) *Politics* VII—14.

(4) Levi’s collection of *Bavaru Jaatak* No. 389.

(5) *Cambridge Ancient India*—I—397.

one by name Onesicritus, a disciple of the cynic philosopher—Diogenes whom Alexander sent to interview the Indian ascetics who walked about naked in the town, and one of them called by the Greeks—Kalanos⁽¹⁾ had a debate with the Greek philosopher through interpreters and an interview with Alexander himself⁽²⁾.

That the religious thought of India had leavened the pre-Christian beliefs of Europe is testified to by the pages of history. As early as 1,400 B.C., the Thracians adored deities with Indian names.⁽³⁾ Pythagoras had visited Egypt which had adopted the doctrine of metempsychosis from India about 500 B.C.⁽⁴⁾ After about 530 B.C., the Persian Empire extended from the valley of the Nile and from Macedonia to Babylon, and the army of Xerxes, defeated at Marathon, included Indian soldiers. And after the return of Alexander, the Hellenistic Kings ruled over his Empire and the Bactrian Kings ruled over the Punjab and other adjacent provinces for at least over a hundred years (200-95 B.C.) and one of them—Menander, even became a convert to Buddhism (180-160 B.C.). Seleucus Nicator sent Megasthenes as his envoy to Chandragupt at Pataliputra about 302 B.C. and he was an observant Greek and recorded all he saw. Though his memoirs are partially lost, there can be no doubt that Buddhism must have been the subject of his deep study and that he must have carried home its knowledge to enlighten his countrymen.

Megasthenes was followed by Dionysius sent by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.) while Bindushar, father of Ashoke, had exchanged missions with Antiochus, and according to a well known anecdote offered to buy a professor. But Antiochus replied that Greek professors were not for sale.⁽⁵⁾

(1) A corruption of "Kalyan," meaning "Hail" a form of acclamation converted into a name.

(2) Plutarch's *Alexander* 65; *Strabo* XVO—714f; *Cambridge Indian History*—Volume I, 358-59.

(3) Sir O. Eliots' *3 Hinduism and*

Buddhism, p.434.

(4) Flinders Petrie *Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity*.

(5) *Hegastendros in Athenæus* 14-652; V. Smith, *Early History of India* (3rd Ed.) 147.

Ashoke in his edict (256-B.C.) recited the fact that he had spread the *Dhamm* as far as the dominions of Antiochus, where dwelt the four kings named Ptolemy, Antiochus, Magas, and Alexander. These kings have been identified to be the rulers of Syria, Egypt, Macedonia, Cyrene and Spirus. Alberuni, the Arabian historian of the eleventh century, states that in former times Khurasan, Persia, Irak (Mesopotamia), Koshul and the country up to the frontiers of Syria, were *Buddhistic*.⁽¹⁾ An Indian Colony from the Punjab settled down in Parthia and thence shifted to Armenia (149-127 B.C.), ⁽²⁾ and another Indian Colony was settled at Alexandria at the time of Trajan (b. 98 A.D. d. 117 A.D.). In 21 A.D. Augustus while at Athens received an embassy from India which came *via* Antioch. It was accompanied by a person called Zamanocheegas, probably a corruption of Saman Achary, an Indian from Bargosa who astonished the Athenians by publicly burning himself alive. ⁽³⁾ He was probably a *Bhikkhu* as his name suggests.

India had even a much earlier and closer connection with Babylon, and Babylon had a similar connection with Egypt which was the distributing centre for all Europe. Amarna testify to the antiquity and intimacy of this connection. The Jews were taken prisoners by the Babylonians and released in 538 B.C. with their religious horizon enlarged and modified by the Zoroastrian religion which is only a form of the ancient Vedic faith.⁽⁴⁾

But this is not all,—Hindu gods were actually worshipped both in Egypt and in Rome at least 300 years before the advent of the Christian era. The worship of *Magna Mater* was known in Rome before 200 B.C., and that of *Isis* and *Serapis* in the time of Sulla, the Dictator (138-78 B.C.). In the early centuries of the Christian era, *Mithra* was worshipped not only in Rome but in most parts of Europe and with the infiltration of Oriental ideas the Indian monasticism made its way into Europe where tenets similar to those preached by *Gautam* became current.

(1) Alberuni's—*India* (Tr. E. G. (2) *Strabo* XV. 73; *Dion Cassius* IX—58.

(3) (1907) *J. R. A. S.* 968.

(4) See General Introduction. p. 11,12

Buddh began to exercise the thoughts of philosophers and religious preachers. The theories of metempsychosis and ascetism are both purely Indian, but they both migrated to Europe and became the tenets of societies and communities of cosmopolitan tastes such as the Orphic societies.

Indeed, the Indian religions had become so widely known in Europe about the dawn of Christianity that we find Bardesanes, one of the Gnostic teachers (233-155 B.C.), writing a book on Indian religions in which he mentions the doctrine of *Karm* and the pre-existence of the soul. Bardesanes and Carpocrates were both teachers at Alexandria, and though their works have perished and are known by reference to them by their opponents, there is enough in them to shew that Bardesanes regarded suffering as inherent to existence and believed in re-incarnation as induced by *Karm*. And even St. Paul believed in it, and referred to it in his Epistles to the Romans in which he says: "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died."⁽¹⁾ A few years later, Mani (215-276 A.D.) a native of Ecbatana founded a sect known as Manichæism which was closely allied to Buddhism. Mani had travelled through Afghanistan, Bactria and India, and his disciples carried his faith to Central Asia and China, while in the West it became the faith of the Bogomils and Albigenes. Considerable light has been thrown on the tenets of this sect by recent discoveries of Manichæan manuscripts in Central Asia, one of which, a treatise discovered at Tunhunag is in the form of a Buddhist Sutt and speaks of Mani as the Tathagat and of Buddh as Transformation (Huafo) and the Bodhisatv (Ti-tsang). Even more important is the confessional formula found in the same locality which is similar to the Patimoksh and refers to Buddh, the Shamuni and the Bo tree, uses Buddhist terminology and forbids the taking of life, praises celibacy, poverty and fasting, all of which are foreign to the religions of Persia and Babylon.

Another religious teacher from the West, Apollonius is said to have visited India in search of its religion and his views

(1) Rom. VII—8.

also conform to the Buddhistic tenets. Plotinus equally held the same view and urged that the world was not the creation of the evil one but was transitory, imperfect and unreal. His system has been called dynamic pantheism, because while admitting God to be the source of energy, He is described as devoid of all qualities and so powerless to control its movements. Plotinus holds fasting, meditation detachment and inaction as the highest morality in life, the objective of which is ecstasy obtainable in union with God. In life such ecstasy can be obtained, but it is not permanent, though it is a solatium to the pilgrims life. It is only after death, when impelled by virtue, that the soul within enters the universal soul and eternal ecstasy is possible.

The question of Buddho-Christian analogues has given rise to a voluminous literature. ⁽¹⁾ Similarly Sallastius (300 A.D.) upheld metempsychosis as demonstrable.

Since the tenets of Buddhism have become widely known in Europe and America, scholars have naturally become curious to examine the coincidences between the two religions, and with accumulation of evidence, made possible by the translation of the Buddhist canon, an active controversy has sprung up whether Christian ethics is not the god-child of Buddhism. There are those who entertain no doubt in the matter, and, as was to be expected, there are others who see in the parallelisms nothing beyond accidental coincidences, while there is an intermediate opinion, which while not tracing the evolution of the later to the older religion, still cannot avoid the conclusion that it did influence the evolution of Christianity. This view is voiced by Sir Charles Eliot, who while finding no evidence of Christ having been brought into a contact with the communities

(1) G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga. *Indische Einflüsse auf evangelische Erzählungen*. Göttingen, 1904. (A revised edition and translation of *Indische invloeden op oude christelijke verhalen*. Leiden, 1901).

G. Faber, *Buddhistische und Neutestamentliche Erzählungen. Das Problem ihrer gegenseitigen Beeinflussung untersucht*. Leipzig, 1913.

Among earlier works may be mentioned :

R. Seydel, *Das Evangelium von*

Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddh. Saga and Buddh-Lehre mit fortlaufender Rücksicht auf andere Religionskreise untersucht Leipzig, 1882.

A. Lillie, *The influence of Buddhism on primitive Christianity*—London, 1893. (Issued in a new edition as *India in primitive Christianity*, 1909).

A. J. Edmunds and M. Anesaki, *Buddhist and Christian Gospels, being Gospel Parallels from Pali Texts*. 4th Ed. Philadelphia, 1908-9.

holding pro-Buddhist views, holds that their ideals were known to him and influenced his own. ⁽¹⁾

That Christ has erected the Buddhist ethics upon Judaic foundation appears to admit of little doubt. This explains the difference in their metaphysics but the identity of other views. The Brahmanical conception of the deity had passed through the same earlier stages as the Hebrew conception, but while the latter did not go beyond the Kingship analogy, the Upanishads carried it further into a cosmic pantheism: "Thou art I, and I am thou" became his formula. Christ applied it to himself and reconciled it by having recourse to the doctrine of incarnation, ⁽²⁾ used in the same sense in which Buddhists explained their Teacher's descent from the Tushit heaven, though John seemed to have stuck to the Vedic view of Creation wholly out of keeping with the Mosaic cosmogony. ⁽³⁾

Buddh was not content to erect his religion upon the old foundation. He rejected alike the doctrine of a personal and an impersonal God of which he could not find sufficient evidence. Having rejected this old foundation, he had to anchor his ethics on the empiric theory of human suffering to which he called in aid the combined and inseparable doctrines of Karm and reincarnation. It enabled him to evolve a self-contained system, but in his effort to escape from one dogma, he fell into another; but the light of reason which had dismissed the one equally dismissed the other. His later disciples must have early realized it and finding their position untenable, they readily restored the rejected doctrines of their Master and filled in the hiatus which his system had left un-resolved. Thus his ethics remained, but it was balanced by the older doctrines of Brahm and Soul; but the attributes of Brahm had never been satisfactorily defined and the religious preacher knew that the people will not readily accept what they are taught but what they themselves believe. The best of religions must yield to the popular cry. It must yield to simplicity of comprehension and the force of instinct. A monotheistic system had always this in its favour and it became substituted

(1) 3 *Hinduism and Buddhism* 436. Col. II—9.

(2) 2 *Phillip* 5-9; 2 *Cor.* VIII—9; (3) *John* I—14.

for the agnostic metaphysics. Local and communal sentiment did the rest. It let in more gods, more saints, more dogmas, more ceremonies. They combined to make the neo-Buddhism of the Mahayans which readily spread through the continent of Asia.

The same forces have made Christianity what it is to-day. Sects have multiplied, new sects are formed. The new is attempted to be reconciled with the old, and in the end humanity will be none the wiser for all the speculation and effort to unveil the inscrutable mystery of life. What are we and where do we go?—These are problems upon which science and dogma have not yet been, and humanly speaking, can never be reconciled. The religions of all nations have struggled to evolve a system supplementing the conclusions of Reason with Faith, and we have therefore to inquire how far the latter embody principles which have become the common heritage of mankind.

An examination of the primitive beliefs of the two nations which have contributed to the stock of human faiths, of the two great Teachers who have founded their world-religions, shows that neither had written his doctrine upon a clean slate. We have seen how far the older Teacher had assimilated some of the dogmas of his own religion. We now proceed to inquire to what extent the founder of Christianity had done the same.

The history of the pre-Christian theology is the history of the the religious beliefs of the Israelites ⁽¹⁾ which marks three distinct stages in their religious history. We have in the first instance the Babylonian king of Egypt, under whom the Hebrews lived and worshipped one God called Yahweh ⁽²⁾ who appears to have been the Babylonian god worshipped as far back as 2000 B.C. Moses made him the god of Israel and so laid the foundation of a national unity which was still then lacking. In so selecting one God for worship by his tribe, Moses laid the foundation of monotheism; but it was then

(1) Jews, Hebrews, Israelites are different names for the same people.

(2) *Jahweh*, then *Jehovah*.

only monolatry, and not monotheism. He recognized the existence of other gods but backed his own against them.

In 588 B.C. Jerusalem fell to Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, (604-561 B.C.) who ordered its evacuation and himself removed as prisoners bulk of the people of Judah to Chaldea. The Jews had been since a subject race for fifty years. They remained so under the Chaldeans and when a few years later Babylon itself fell to the Persians (538 B.C.), the Jews became subject to Persia, who permitted some of them to return. Two hundred years later, both they and their masters passed under Greek domination when Jerusalem had to surrender to the victorious forces of Alexander the Great (332 B.C.), who invited them to settle in his new city of Alexandria. On the death of Alexander in 323 B.C. Palestine fell to the lot of one of his successors to whom Egypt was assigned. It remained under Egypt until 198 B.C. when it was conquered by Syria. The Syrians persecuted them which provoked them to a series of revolts led by Mattathias and his able son Judas Maccabæus, till they were able to regain their independence in 140 B.C. and Maccabæus was appointed their King. But their independence was only short-lived and internecine quarrels led to the intervention of Rome, till it was annexed by Pompey to the Roman Empire. (63 B.C.).

During their long period of captivity and exile, the Jews continued to flourish by trade and developed qualities which have made their influence world-wide. The exiled Jews were deeply conservative in their religion and continued to maintain a close connection with their brethren who had escaped their fate. In their religious outlook they had little to teach but a great deal to learn. They still worshipped their own God.

The prophets Elijah and Elisha took up cudgels against the worship of Yahweh in friendly alliance with Baal who had been the god of the Canaanites and of Egypt. In this prophetic movement the exclusion of all gods gave to Yahweh the credit for victory of the Israelites over their neighbours. They entered into a covenant with him for mutual help and support. The prophets or the priests of Israel now became

the sole interpreters of Yahweh's wishes. The prophets began to guide the national impulse. In pre-prophetic Israel polygamy was the theory and bigamy the usual practice. Brides were purchased and widows were sold as property ⁽¹⁾; a female slave could be used as a concubine ⁽²⁾, and daughters sold ⁽³⁾ and could not inherit to their father. The prophets strove to remove this inequality of the sexes by permitting widows to re-marry ⁽⁴⁾ and daughters to inherit. ⁽⁵⁾ But while the prophets liberalized their social institutions, they gave to their religion a rigidity and a colour which made their religion the religion of a book. The priests of all countries lay a dominant emphasis on written scriptures, and the priestly Code of the Jews professed to promulgate a law to cover every step in life and every action in religion. It placed the unfortunate Jews under the iron grip not only of their religion but also of their religious priests. The Rabbi and the Scribes became their eyes and ears in all matters, whether political, social and religious; for religion had by now acquired a new meaning and embraced all functions of the mind.

At the same time their domination by the Persians, Egyptians and the Greeks and their wide wanderings in pursuit of trade had given them opportunities to absorb new ideas which became easily fused with the skeleton scheme of their domestic system. The dispersed Jews desiring to give their community a cohesiveness established meeting places called synagogues to which were attached schools for children in charge of honorary teachers called "Scribes." Meetings for prayer, praise and scripture-reading were held in them. These institutions were extended to Palestine and they soon eclipsed and later superseded the temple at Jerusalem and offered worship without sacrifice. The Israelites knew of the demons; but they had no place for angels in their religion. These were soon added, and archangels and angels brought under an ordered system of their religion to which was added a comprehensive system of demonology in which the serpent was more closely identified as

(1) *1 Kings* II—21.

(2) *Exodus* XXI—8.

(3) *Exodus* XXX—7.

(4) *Ruth* I—9.

(5) *Num.* III—6.

Satan; ⁽¹⁾ while their political despondency and centuries of servitude created in their mind the longing for a Saviour, ⁽²⁾ which began to be voiced by their scriptures as the only hope of a fallen people. They thought their despondency would surely not be unredressed. They hoped for an after-life; ⁽³⁾ and the conception of God was widened into a universal spirit pervading the universe not excluding Hell. ⁽⁴⁾ A hope was expressed that the dead may rise again to live again better lives.

This hope became a settled conviction and the hope gave rise to an expectation, and the expectation to an assured faith, transferred from the popular literature to the popular dogma. ⁽⁵⁾ "From Judaism it passed into Christianity, where it was seen as guaranteed by the resurrection of Christ; the resurrection being not of those who have striven and failed, but of the believers and non-believers alike." ⁽⁶⁾ It will thus be seen how certainly, though imperceptibly, Judaism became transformed into a virtually new religion under the impact of foreign conquerors and of the religious ideas they imparted or which the Jews in their peregrinations picked up and passed on to their people. The abandonment of sacrifices, and of the temples where they were offered; the establishment of synagogues with their attached seminaries, the idea of re-birth, the hierarchy of archangels and angels were all foreign ideas which are similar to, if not identical with those of Buddhism. The central movement of the vital religion in Judaism passed on to Christianity, which added to it the doctrine of the Trinity which was absent from Judaism. That was essentially an Indian doctrine and the love of man, and the service of man had never been a part of the Judaism. It is an essentially Buddhist doctrine—and a doctrine which seriously antagonised Hinduism. There is then the order of monasticism, ⁽⁷⁾ and poverty, and the abolition of praying in public, ⁽⁸⁾ and the observance of the rules of morality which closely follow the teachings of Buddh.

(1) *Tobit* III—17; V—4, XII—15.

(2) *Job* XIX—25-27.

(3) *Psalms* XII—5-8; XVI—9-11; XXX—3.

(4) *Psalms* CXXXIX—8-18.

(5) *Daniel* XII—2.

(6) *Luke* XX—34-37.

(7) *Math.* VI—25-34.

(8) *Math.* VI—5, 6.

The parallelisms between the legendary life of Gautam and that of Christ have been pointed out to be too close to be casual, and appear on the other hand, to be remarkably striking and so are the analogous between the Buddhistic scriptures and the Christian gospels. The former may be categorised as follows:—

- (1) Miraculous conception.
- (2) Virgin Mother.
- (3) Miraculous birth.
- (4) Simeon in the temple.⁽¹⁾ “This is generally admitted to be the most important of the parallelisms and is accepted by Vanden Bergh, Pischal, and others”.⁽²⁾
- (5) The visit to Jerusalem.⁽³⁾ “Vanden Bergh admits that there was no feast, and that the gods who came to visit Gautam ⁽⁴⁾ can scarcely be compared with the Jewish doctors, but considers it important enough to presuppose the possibility of Indian influence”.⁽⁵⁾
- (6) *Baptism*.—When the infant Gautam was being taken to the temple, he pointed out that it was unnecessary as he was superior to the gods, yet he went conforming to the custom of the world.⁽⁶⁾ The parallel is to be found in the following passage of the Gospel according to the Hebrews where it is said: “Behold the mother of the Lord and his brethren said to him: John the Baptist baptizeth for the remission of sins, let us go and be baptized by him. But he said to them, in what have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him, save perchance it is this very thing which I said, that it is ignorance.”⁽⁷⁾

(1) *Luke II. 36 ff.*

(2) Thomas: *Life of Buddha* 238.

(3) *Luke II. 41 ff.*

(4) *Lalit Vistara*.

(5) Thomas, *Life of Buddha* 239.

(6) *Lalit Vistara*.

(7) Quoted by Jerome Adv. Pelag III—2; Modern version in *Math III—13*.

“Van Den Bergh holds that this is the original form of the Gospel account.” It is clear, that if it were, the parallel would be closer.” (1)

- (7) *The Temptation*.—(2) Mar similarly tempted Buddh.

On this parallelism Dr. Thomas adds. “It is still possible to maintain that some form of Buddhist legend was known to the Evangelists.” (3)

- (8) *Praise by Kisa Gotami*.—(4) This parallelism refers to the fact that when Rahul was born and the news given to Gautam by the woman Kisa Gotami who exclaimed:
Happy indeed is the mother
Happy indeed is the father
Happy indeed is the wife who has such a husband.

Gautam exclaimed “Rahula is born, a bond is born.”
The parallelism is admitted. (5)

- (9) *The widow's mite*.—(6) The reference is to the following passage in the *Sutralankar*.
“A poor maiden, who had heard the monks preaching recollected that sometime before, she had found in a dung-heap two mites (copper mites), so taking these forthwith she offered them as a gift to the priesthood in charity. Thereupon the President (Buddh) disregarding the rich gifts of others and beholding the deep principle of faith praised her pious charity. Soon afterwards the King's gaze fell upon her and she was made his chief Queen. But this parallelism does not go against the Evangelists as the *Sutralankar* was composed later than the Gospels.

(1) Thomas: *Life of Buddh* 239.

(2) *Buddh Charita*, Bk. XIII: 49
S.B.E. 137. *Matth.* IV--2-12. *Padhan Sutta*. 10 S.B.E. 68, 69.

(3) Thomas, *Life of Buddh* 240.

(4) *Luke* XI--27

(5) See Ch. IV pp. 93, 94.

(6) *Luke* XXI--1-4, *Mark* XII--41-44.

- (10) *Peter walking on the sea*—⁽¹⁾ A lay disciple crossed a river by walking across its swollen surface. Dr. Thomas says. "The story cannot be proved to be pre-Christian but the idea certainly is, as the power of going over water as if on dry land is one of the magic powers attained by concentration."
- (11) *The Samaritan woman*.—⁽²⁾ The story of Anand having drunk water from the hands of a Matanga woman given in the preceding text⁽³⁾ is held to be clearly imparted into the Gospels; the more so as the ban of the Jews on Samaritans belongs to a later age and is, therefore, an anachronism in the Gospels whereas it is natural in a Buddhist setting.⁽⁴⁾
- (12) *The end of the world*.—⁽⁵⁾ Both describe the end of the world. In the Jaatak the gods descend and addressing the people as friends announce the coming of a new cycle at the end of a lac of years when a conflagration will destroy the world. They ask the people to practise friendliness, compassion, sympathy and equanimity.
- (13) *Choosing the disciples*.—⁽⁶⁾ Buddh had his five disciples under the Pipal tree. The pipal is a variety of fig. Jesus turned to his disciple Nathaniel and said "When thou wast under the fig tree, I saw thee." There is undoubtedly the fig tree in both but in the one case the Teacher was under the fig tree, but in the other the pupil was there. Seydel says that the scriptural text refers to the Teacher and not the pupil. "If so," Dr. Thomas observes, "With this alteration of the text we thus get not only a parallel, but an equally good piece of Bible exegesis."⁽⁷⁾

(1) *Matth.* XIV—28.

(2) *John* IV—9.

(3) *See* Ch. XI ante p. 269.

(4) Thomas: *Life of Buddha* 242.

(5) 2 *Pes*, III—10-12 and Introduction to the *Jaatak*.

(6) *John* I—48.

(7) *Life of Buddha* 244.

(14) *The Prodigal Son.*—⁽¹⁾ The Buddhist Parable has been given elsewhere.⁽²⁾ It occurs in the work—Lotus Ch. IV. the age ■ which ■ computed to be the second century A.D. Van den Bergh thinks that both the parables are probably based on an earlier story. This is, however, a mere possibility ; and as the computation of the age of the Buddhist Sutra is equally conjectural, the verdict one should be inclined to return is the Scotch “Not proven.”

(15) *The man who was born blind.*—⁽³⁾ As Jesus passed by he saw a man born blind and his disciples asked him : “Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents that he was born blind ?” Jesus answered that it was not due to either causes, but “that the works of God should be made manifest in him,” or in one word, fate.

In Lotus Ch. 5 a man similarly born was stated to be paying the penalty for his past deeds. He was cured by a physician and then he saw his former foolishness. The parallelism lies in the question which imputes to the disciples the settled faith in the doctrine of Karm. Dr. Thomas thinks that it was equally known to the Pythagorians and was well-known to the Greeks. “How the Jews actually acquired it may be questioned, but it was scarcely from an Indian work of the second century.”⁽⁴⁾ But the Indian work did not promulgate it for the first time. The doctrine is as old as the Hindu philosophy and was well known in the pre-Buddhistic days. And as for the Pythagorean ethics, Pythagoras himself was born about 540 or 50 B.C. long after Gautam ; and his brotherhood had much in common with Buddhism ; what has been transmitted to us in

(1) Luke XV—11-32.

(2) Ch. XVI pp. 406, 407 ante.

■ John IX—2.

(4) Thomas: *Life of Buddha*—245.

that respect is characteristic rather of the life and discipline of their peculiar society than their philosophy ; whereas the doctrine had been well developed in India centuries before his age. It seems likely that the Pythagorians had themselves borrowed their ethics from either Hinduism or Buddhism.

(16) *The Transfiguration.*—⁽¹⁾ Jesus brought his four disciples to the mountain "and was transfigured before them : and his face did shine as the Sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Similar transfiguration took place twice to Buddha, once when he had attained to Buddh-hood and another when he was passing away.⁽²⁾ On this occasion as soon as the Blessed One had donned the robes of cloth of gold, burnished and ready for wear, it appeared to have lost its splendour.⁽³⁾

(17) *The miracle of the loaves and fishes.*—⁽⁴⁾ A company of five thousand people had appeared and they had to be fed. Phillip complained to Jesus that he had only two hundred pennyworth of bread, and a lad had five barley loaves and two small fishes. Jesus blessed them, fed the whole company and the fragments left over filled twelve baskets.

In the Introduction to Jaatak No. 78—'The wife of a gild-master had placed a cake in the bowl of the Tathagat. He and his five hundred disciples fed on it as also did the gild-master and his wife but the cake never came to an end. They informed the Lord who ordered it to be thrown down the gate of the Jitvan which was down a slope near the gate. "And to this day, that place at the end of the slope is known as the Kapallapuv (Pan-cake)."

(1) *Matth. XVII—2.*

(2) *Parinirvan IV—50 ; 11 S. B. E. 81.*

(3) *Ib. IV—47 ; 11 S. B. E. 80, 81.*

(4) *John, VI—3-12.*

Not only ■ the Revised Version but more so in the Apocrypha, passages such as these abound. "The canonical gospels show great caution in drawing on this fund of tradition, but a number of Buddhist legends make their appearance in the Apocryphal gospels and are so obviously Indian in character that it can hardly be maintained that they were invented in Palestine or Egypt and spread thence eastwards. Trees bend down before the young Christ, and dragons (*nags*) adore him: when he goes to school to learn the alphabet, he convicts his teacher of ignorance and the Goodman faints. (1) When he enters a temple in Egypt the images prostrate themselves before him just as they do before the young Gautam in the temple of Kapilvastu. (2) Mary is luminous before the birth of Christ which takes place without pain or impurity. (3) But the parallel is most curious, because the incident related is unusual in both Indian and European literature, in the detailed narrative in the gospel of James, and also in the *Lalit Vistara* relating how all activity of mankind and nature was suddenly interrupted at the moment of the nativity. (4) Wind, stars and rivers stayed their motion and labourers stood still in the attitude in which each was surprised. The same gospel of James also relates that Mary when six months old took seven steps, which must surely be an echo of the legend which attributes the same feat to the infant Buddh. " (5)

The following parallelisms in the discourses of the two great Teachers require no comment :

(18) *Treasure in heaven.*

Buddh:—Let the Bhikkhu subdue his passion for human and celestial pleasures, then having conquered existence, he would command the Dham. Such a one will wander rightly in the world.

A treasure that is laid up in a deep pit profits nothing and may easily be lost. The real treasure that

(1) *Gospel of Thomas* (long version) Ch. VI, XIV cf. *Lalit Vistara* Ch. X.

(2) *Pseudo-Matth.* Ch. XXII—XXIV; *Lalit Vistara* Ch. VIII.

(3) *Pseudo-Matth.* Ch. XIII cf. *Dig.*

Nik. 14; *Maj. Nik.* 123. See Ch. ante.

(4) *Gospel of James* XVIII and *Lalit Vistara* Ch. VII.

(5) Sir C. Elliot's—*S. Hinduism and Buddhism*—441, 442.

is laid up through charity and piety, temperance, self-control or deeds of merit is laid secure and cannot pass away. It is never gained by despoiling others, and no thief can steal it. A man, when he dies, must leave the fleeting wealth of the world, but this treasure of the virtuous acts he takes with him. Let the wise do good deeds; they are a treasure that can never be lost.⁽¹⁾

Jesus :—Lay not up for yourself treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up yourselves treasures in heaven where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.⁽²⁾

(19) *Sermon on the Mount.*

(*Buddh*):—"Blessed is he who has understood the Dham. Blessed is he who does no harm to his fellow-beings. Blessed is he who overcomes sin and is free from passion. To the highest bliss has he attained who has conquered all selfishness and vanity. (³)

" Blissful is freedom from malice. Blissful is absence of lust and the loss of pride that comes from the thought "Jain."⁽⁴⁾

" Be merciful to those who struggle; have compassion upon the sufferers; pity the creatures who are hopelessly entangled in the snares of sorrow."⁽⁵⁾

Jesus.—" Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth."⁽⁶⁾

(20) *Buddh* saw a prostrate Bhikkhu who had no one to look after. He upbraided the Bhikkhus and said, "If ye, O Bhikkhus, wait not one upon the other,

(1) *Nidhikant Sutta* R. Dev. p. 127.

(2) *Matth.* VI—19-21.

(3) Benares Sermon (Gya. Tchao Roll

Pa) quoted in Carus: *Gospel of Buddhism* 24.

(4) *M.V.* I—3-4.

Carus: *Gospel of Buddhism* 36.

(5) *Matth.* V—3, 5.

who is there, indeed who will wait upon you ?
Whosoever, O Bhikkhus, would wait upon me, ■
should wait upon the sick.”⁽¹⁾

Jesus :—(Referring to the resurrection).

“ And the King shall answer and say unto them, verily I say unto you inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

“ Then shall he answer them saying, verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.”⁽²⁾

Seydel gives fifty such instances, but Vanden Bergh reduces them to nine ; other writers admit these close parallelisms which the others reject altogether.

An able writer and a devout Christian is free to admit that the teachings of Christ, both in their letter and their spirit, owe their inception to India. After referring to some of the parallelisms already noted, he writes : “ That Christ had come under the influence of the spiritual ideas of the Far East is a hypothesis which explains many things, and for which, therefore, there are many things to be said.....Even the words which Christ is reported to have used about his own kinship to and oneness with ‘ the Father ’—words on which all the fantastic structures of Christian theology have been based—are but the expressions, in a new notation, of the sublime Indian doctrine that ‘ He is the true self of every creature ’,—that ‘ Brahm and the self are one ’.....The ideas which dominate Christ’s teaching, and which, according to my hypothesis, had come to him from the Far East were not wholly new to the Græco-Roman world of his day. First Pythagoras and then Plato had expounded them, from his own point of view and in his own language, to an esoteric circle of disciples. But no popular exposition of them had been attempted in the West till Christ came under their

(1) *M. F.* VIII—26 ; 17 S.B.E. 241.

(2) *Matth.* XXV—40, 45.

influence and was captivated by their truth and beauty. Whether they were consciously or unconsciously adopted by Christ, matters little. The broad fact confronts us, that the ideas, which he expounded, coincide, at every vital point, with ideas which were current in India many centuries before the Christian era. Had India, through all these centuries, been entirely walled off from Western Asia and Southern Europe, the coincidences between the teaching of Christ and the teaching of Buddha and his forerunners might conceivably be regarded as purely fortuitous. But never before the establishment of British rule in India, had the opportunities for intercourse between East and West been so numerous or so favourable as in the centuries which preceded the birth of Christ..... What Buddha had done to the ideas of the Upanishads, Christ did to the same ideas when they had come to him, as they probably did, through the medium of Buddha's ethical teaching,—he made them available for the daily needs of ordinary men. But the method by which Christ worked was entirely his own. To graft the spiritual idealism of India on the stem of Hebrew poetry, and so to bring it home to the *heart*, rather than to the *mind* or the *conscience*, was the work of his life.”⁽¹⁾

That the Buddhism of Buddha was not long the Buddhism of the people is as true as that the Christianity of Christ was not long the Christianity of the people. After the death of both, schism tore up their Church into rival camps and as Buddhism became subdivided into two main sects, so did Christianity, and for a similar reason. Neither Buddha nor Jesus had appointed a successor to take their place. Their religion was a religious republic in which, after the founder all disciples were equal, and so were treated by the Master. Of course, those attached to their persons were naturally accorded a higher position, but it was only a courtesy and not a right. When Buddha died the fundamental instinct of man suddenly rose above the attachment and religious devotion of the disciples, and their susceptibilities had to be accommodated to the precepts of the religion. Consequently in

(1) *The Creed of Buddha* by the Author of *The Creed of Christ*. 278—281.

comparing the two religions the tenets and rituals of the older religion as obtaining, when those of Christianity were first settled, should alone be taken into account. Now the four Gospels which embody the teaching of Christ were admittedly composed at least a century after the death of Christ. In the years immediately following that event Christianity, like Buddhism, was an Order of cenobite monks. The last of the Apostles, St. John died about 100 A.D. and the first organization of the Church was settled during the next five hundred years to the accession of Pope Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome in 590 A.D. Four general councils were held in this period and they settled the creed for acceptance by the Churches. This was the period of schism and heresies; and the councils had to adopt or overrule the doctrines as promulgated by their leaders.

Monasticism in connection with the churches dates from the close of the third century, though the name of St. Anthony (251-356 A.D.) is associated with the foundation of first Christian monasteries; and it is admitted that "retirement from the world and its business as conducive to religious meditation, had its origin in periods long anterior to the Christian era, and was practised by both Brahmans and Buddhists." (1) It is equally admitted that "the influence of Gnosticism and Neo-Platonism in their doctrine of the antagonism between the body and the soul prepared the mind of the Christians to attach a high value to an ascetic and contemplative life." (2) "That the Gnostics were deeply imbued with the spirit of Buddhism is apparent from their tenets which were a paraphrase of the Buddhist Doctrine as preached by the Mahayan school for they held that one Supreme Intelligence, dwelling in darkness unapproachable, gave existence to a line of Aeons, or heavenly spirits who were all, more or less, partakers of His Nature and included in His Glory, though individually separate from the Sovereign Deity. Of the Aeons, Christ or Logos was the Chief—an emanation from God." (3)

(1) Rev. E. D. Price: "*Story of Religions*" 123.

(2) *Ib.*
(3) *Ib.* 129.

Other sects, *e.g.*, the Corinthians, Monarchians and the Manicheans to which sect Augustine himself at one time belonged, maintained the same view. The Manichean sect was founded by Manu, a Persian who combined the Zoroastrian dualism with Christian doctrine. It has already been seen that Zoroastrianism was only an off-shoot of Vedantism. These beliefs were declared as heresies only by the council of Nicæa (325 A.D.) who declared in favour of the Nicene creed. But the sects though out-numbered have never been silenced, and the Nestorian Christians still survive and have established a church of their own. They hold that Christ was only a man but became afterwards divine. As regards the text of his teaching the original authentic version contained in the collection of fourteen books bears a still closer resemblance between the two religions, so much so that the life of the younger Teacher seems like the life of Buddha edited in Judea. As is well-known, this version was considerably rationalized in the Revised Version of the English Church, but the Apocrypha is still regarded as authoritative to this extent that "the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine."⁽¹⁾

The present day Christianity is thus no longer the Christianity as it was understood by the Christian fathers. As Herbert Spencer remarked: "Then again, there is the truth, which is becoming more and more manifest, that real creeds continually diverge from normal creeds and adapt themselves to new social and individual requirements. The contrast between mediæval Christianity and the present Christianity of Protestant countries, or again the contrast between the belief in a devil to torment the wicked, strenuously held early in their country, and the spreading denial or again the recent expression of opinion by a Roman Catholic that there

(1) Art. VI. The word "Apocrypha" means "Hidden secret" i.e., "Esoteric." But much later it came to mean "of doubtful authority or authenticity" and the books would more correctly be described as "Deuterocanonical" or "Ecclesiastical": The authorised version of the Bible was settled only in 1611 A.D.; and it was revised in 1881-1885.

may be happiness in hell, suffice to show the re-moulding of what is practically a quite different creed. And when we observe, too, how in modern preaching theological dogmas are dropping into the background and ethical doctrines coming into the foreground, it seems that in course of time we shall reach a stage in which, recognizing the mystery of things as insoluble, religious organizations will be devoted to ethical culture.⁽¹⁾"

Christianity even as it is now understood, how does it compare with Buddhism? It is quite another story and must be the subject of another chapter.

The fact is that critics have a great difficulty in acting as judges in these cases. A fair judge would have to be wholly free from religious bias which cannot be said of every writer. In considering this question, we have not only to eliminate sentiment, but give our verdict upon the cumulative facts and circumstances, as much upon the analogies of the lives as of the teaching and of the ritual, the canonization of Buddha as a Christian saint to whom a church was dedicated as far west as Palermo, and the obvious fact that India was in close touch with Palestine and Greece and the knowledge of Indian philosophy and its religions had penetrated as far as Rome. Jerusalem is after all only 2,000 miles from Peshawar; Buddhist learning was at its height in the third and the fourth century B.C. and if Buddhism could invade the mountainous passes of the Himalayan countries as far as China which is at least equi-distant, it is not surprising that the well-beaten caravan routes of the west exported Indian learning along with the cargo of ivory, sandal-wood and spices which Solomon acknowledgedly received as the produce of India. Of course, as is well known, caravans in those days were moving camps with their full equipment of priests, barbers and beggars—priests being necessary not only for the performance of daily rites, but also for the performance of ceremonies attending

(1) 2 *Autobiography* 468; Such is the view of the distinguished authors of "Essays and Reviews" (1860) written by six clergymen including Dr. Temple afterwards the Archbishop of Canterbury

and Prof. Jowett which led to the establishment of the Broad Church which rejects miracles and adopts "the precepts rather than the theology of religion."

births, marriages and deaths. The caravan route usually took four to six months to traverse by slow stages, but there was a quicker sea-route. Buddhist missionaries had effected their conquest in the north, east and south as far as the sea and beyond; they had converted Afghanistan and Central Asia; they had gone on at least two missions to Rome. They could not have left out the intervening region which offered such promising field for their missionary enterprise. The possibility and even the probability of this contact is now no longer denied; but what is doubted is its certainty which only a close study of the earlier canons can dispel.

The influence of Buddhism upon the Arabian Prophet can only be traced through the medium of Christianity, though Mr. Havell ascribes the rise of Islam to the spiritual impetus imparted by Buddhism. "It was," he says, "borne along the highways of commerce by sea and land to the furthest confines of Asia both in the east and west. And though the echoes of the debating halls of India may not have resounded upon the coasts of Arabia so clearly as they did among the hills of the further east, the doctrine of the unity of Godhead implicit in the theory of the One in Many was probably as familiar to the camel-drivers of Arabian caravans as it was to the students of China, long before the Prophet raised the banner of Islam.

"Mohammad was an inspired teacher who skilfully adapted his theological formulas to Arabian tribal traditions, in the same way as Buddh had established the Law upon the traditions of the Indo-Aryan village community. If he was not as familiar with Indian religious thought as he was with the teaching of Christianity, he certainly caught the spirit of *Bhakti* which was common to them both. The conflict between Islam and Hinduism was chiefly on matters of ritual, like the dispute of the Christian Church. On higher spiritual grounds the Brahman pandit and the Mulla found a *modus vivendi*, for India was a motherland to them both."⁽¹⁾

(1) Havell (E. B.): *The History of Aryan Rule in India* 200—210.

Apart, however, from the influence of Buddhism upon the Islamic religion and art, pre-Islamic cults still survive in the Islamic countries, which owe their inception or pristine vigour to their association with Buddhism. Such is the cult of the Sufis which has added the spiritual or mystic side to Islam. But the Sufis existed long before the advent of the Arabian Prophet. They had, in fact, a dominating influence in Arabia, the people of which either followed the Greek or the Indian lead and had accordingly ranged themselves as *Ischachaiouns* (or the walkers) or the *Ischrachaiouns* (the contemplators). When Mahomed appeared, these became the *Muteklim* (metaphysicians) and the Sufis (mystics). The latter put an esoteric interpretation on both the Kuran and the Hadiyah or collected sayings of the Prophet; they dispense with the Jemaat and other formalities of the mosque; they, in many cases, recognize the fact of spiritual religion outside Islam, and in general they observe the rules of poverty, abstinence from wine, and celibacy. The religious order of Derveshes closely followed the practices of the Hindu and Buddhist monks; they live in convents (called *Takkias* or *Khankas*) endowed with lands or Waqf just as the Buddhist *muths* were, and Hindu *muths* are, endowed with inam lands incapable of alienation.

The head of the convent is a Sheikh or Murshad who represents the *Pir* or the original founder of the Order. They canonize their members who have become conspicuous for their piety or spiritual excellence. The Derveshes extend to all Islamic countries, Egypt, Turkey, Persia, India and Central Asia. They practise *Yoge* with a view to produce an ecstatic state in which the soul emancipated from its earthly envelope rises to the spiritual height when it is able to unite and hold communion with God. It gives them supernatural power to cure diseases, charm snakes and work miracles. As a religious sect the Derveshes stand apart from the rest of the Musalmans, holding as they do that "the paths leading to God are as many as the breaths of His creatures."

The Dervishes are divided into thirty-six well-defined orders ■ which, however, only a few survive. They claim to a pre-historic ancestry and one of their order the *Qutbe* ascribe the foundation to the prophet Elijah. In their poetic flights the Persian poets like Sadi and Hafiz have popularized Sufism which has assumed an intellectual movement in the new regime.

But the Dervishes as a class have latterly fallen from their high state, as have their Indian confreres, the Bairagis, Sanyasis and Gossains, the Jogis, Jatis and Odassis, the Bhikshuks and Vanprusths, the Jungums of North India and the Bonzes or Buddhist Bhikkhus. The "Dervish" like the Bhikkhu means a beggar, the word "Dervish" in Persian meaning "the sill of the door" or those who beg from door to door which they now do and with the decadence of the high idealism of which they were the first fruit, the Dervishes are no more than wandering mendicants who live by professional jugglery, magic and chicanery, as do the other religious beggars and vagabonds, who though masquerading as religious friars, Sadhus or Murshads, only prey upon the credulity and guilelessness of the multitude.⁽¹⁾

The inspiration of the Buddhist theology did not become exhausted with the decline of Buddhism in India. It is well-known that Akbar drew his inspiration from that perennial fountain of religious thought. The short-lived religion of *Din e Ilahi* which he founded, was on the basis of the chapters, Sanghs and the rituals prescribed by Gautam Muni. About the same time another reformer Chaitanya drew his reforming zeal from the Buddhist Gaya Temple, built on the site hallowed by the name of the founder of that religion. Other reformers have similarly drawn upon Buddhism for their tenets and rituals.

(1) See for their history Brown (John P.): *The Dervishes or Oriental Spiritualism* (New Ed. H. A. Rose, O. U. P. 1927).

CHAPTER XVIII

BUDDHISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Buddhism has been subjected to the cross-fire of both Christianity and Hinduism, though it is the parent of one and the child of the other. The combined attack of these two competing creeds has greatly prejudiced the right understanding of its essential doctrine. The two religions have been contrasted and it has been roundly asserted that while Christianity recognizes the existence of a personal God who reveals himself through man to man and through whom alone he extends his Divine Grace of mercy and pardon for his original sin, Buddhism is a *cul de sac*, in that it acknowledges no God, professes no revelation, admits no original sin, appeals to no Grace, admits no intermediary and it lands man into a nothingness. The Hindus attack Buddhism because it denies the supremacy of the Brahmans as the divine-ordained expounders of the creed, denies caste which is the fulcrum of Hinduism, opposes self-mortification as a means to salvation, ridicules its gods and goddesses, decries idol-worship and is in fact a thorough-going, iconoclastic attack upon its most approved and cherished tenets, notions and philosophy.

A general conspectus of Buddhism *vis à vis* the other religions including Christianity has already been given in the last chapter.⁽¹⁾

In this chapter it is proposed to examine the relationship of Buddhism to Christianity in particular—both as understood by its original founders.

But before embarking on a comparison of Buddhism with Christianity, we must be sure that we use the term Christianity in the same sense. For while the Hinyan sect of Buddhism still represents the Orthodox Church, the

(1) Pp. 426—447 *ante*.

same cannot be predicated of Christianity which is now split up into innumerable sects, as widely differing from one another in their essential tenets as the apostolic Christianity differs from Protestantism and Protestantism from the Non-conformist churches, to which many distinguished and able men now belong.

Professor Monier Williams, whose work on Buddhism was the outcome of a series of lectures delivered under the auspices of a Missionary foundation, had naturally to compare or contrast the subject of his lectures with the conviction of his audience. In this respect he may be said to be a whole-hogger, since he sees nothing good in Buddhism, his standard, of course, being Christianity. Other Christian devouts are not likely to agree with him, in that in trying to draw a contrast between the two religions, the learned Professor has taken for granted that the one religion must be false because the other religion is unquestionably true, and it would be blasphemy to think it otherwise.

Now, the first question that the Professor asks and rightly asks is: What do you mean by the term "Religion?" "Clearly the definition of the word religion," he says, "is beset with difficulties, and its etymology is too uncertain to help us in explaining it. We shall, however, be justified if we affirm that every system, claiming to be a religion in the proper sense of the word, must postulate the eternal existence of one living and true God of infinite power, wisdom, and love, the Creator, Designer, and Preserver of all things visible and invisible. It must also take for granted the immortality of man's soul or spirit and the reality of a future state and of an unseen world. It must also postulate in man an innate sense of dependence on a personal God—a sense of reverence and love for Him, springing from a belief in His justice, holiness, wisdom, power, and love, and intensified by a deep consciousness of weakness, and a yearning to be delivered from the presence, tyranny and penalty of sin." (1)

(1) *Buddhism*, 538.

In other words, in the sense in which the Professor uses that term, the word "religion" implies (i) Belief in a personal God ; (ii) Man's dependence upon Him ; (iii) Belief in man's Original Sin ; (iv) Belief in man's soul and (v) its immortality.

If these were the only pre-requisites one would still hesitate to subscribe to the definition, but the Professor adds four additional pre-requisites which makes religion a synonym for Christianity. He says : "Then starting from these assumptions it must satisfy four requisites.

First, it must reveal the Creator in His Nature and attributes to His creature, man.

Secondly, it must reveal man to himself. It must impart to him a knowledge of his own nature and history—what he is ; why he was created ; whither he is tending ; and whether he is at present in a state of decadence downwards from a higher condition, or of a development upwards from a lower.

Thirdly, it must reveal some method by which the finite creature may communicate with the infinite Creator—some plan by which he may gain access to Him and become united with Him, and be saved by Him from the consequences of his own sinful acts.

Fourthly, such a system must prove its title to be called a religion by its regenerating effect on man's nature, by its influence on his thoughts, desires, passions, and feelings ; by its power of subduing all his evil tendencies, by its ability to transform his character and assimilate him to the God it reveals."⁽¹⁾

It is submitted that these requisites are the pre-requisites of dogmatic Christianity, but they are not the pre-requisites of a religion ; which is primarily concerned with man's duty to God and secondarily with man's duty to man since it establishes an indirect *nexus* with God. Strictly speaking, the first alone is the function of religion and the second only of morality ; but since the two duties are inter-related, they have become

(1) *Buddhism* p. 538.

allied and are inseparably associated with the concept. It is true, religion is an elastic term and admits of various interpretations, but its basic connotation is belief in a Supreme Being or Beings especially a personal God controlling the universe and entitled to worship and obedience.

This exhausts its primary sense. But as before remarked, the effect of such belief upon human conduct and the practices resulting from such belief fall equally within its outer ambit.

It has already been seen in the previous chapter how far Buddhism answers to this test of religion.⁽¹⁾ For the present, let us assume that Professor Williams' description of religion is its only meaning. Now, if we analyse his four pre-requisites, what do we find? The first three postulate the Revelation of God by Himself to man, while the fourth refers to social morality, though both the third and the fourth clauses use somewhat loose expressions of which only a general drift is at all clear; since the third condition combines two somewhat independent ideas while no account is taken of the fact that that condition as a whole may not be compatible with the last. Assuming, however, that such is the view of the protagonists of that school of thought, how does Buddhism compare with Christianity? We are not here concerned with the question whether it is or it is not a religion. According to Professor Williams, the one decisive feature which distinguishes Buddhism from Christianity is the personality of Christ. Buddha said to his followers: 'Take nothing from me, trust to yourselves alone.' Christ said, 'Take all from me; trust not to yourself.'⁽²⁾ In other words, while Buddha's religion preached self-help, Christ's religion promised the helping hand of Christ as the Mediator and Redeemer of men's sins which cannot be purged without His divine help. He adds: "And perhaps the most important (point) is, that Christ constantly insisted on the fact that He was God-sent, whereas Buddha always described himself as self-sent."⁽³⁾ But is not this a contrast between Faith and Reason? Christ asks you to believe that he was deputed by

(1) Pp. 417-418 *ante*.

(2) *Buddhism* p. 550.

(3) *Ib.* p. 553.

God to reveal Him to man, whereas Buddha never made any such claim. But what evidence have we beyond the reported claim of Christ to the Messiahship? Suppose Buddha had made a similar claim, would he have then become a greater teacher than Christ? And have not the founders of other religions made a similar claim, and not the evidence in their case the same, viz., their own assertion.

Surely, this is all the difference between Buddhism and Christianity, the difference is all to the credit of Buddhism. For, while Jesus, who called himself the son of Man, became later exalted as the son of God; Buddha never yielded to that temptation and had again and again to correct the asseverations of the devout that he was inspired. So when Upak, the naked Hindu ascetic, met him on his way to Benares, he said: "Your countenance, friend, is serene; your complexion is pure and bright. In whose name, friend, have you retired from the world? Who is your teacher? Whose doctrine do you profess?"—Buddha replied: "I follow no teacher. I have overcome all foes and all stains; I am superior to all men and to all gods: I am the absolute Buddha. And I am going now to Benares to set in motion the Wheel of the Law, as a King, the triumphant Wheel of his Kingdom. I am the conqueror."⁽¹⁾ This was in the early stage of his career; now witness his last words: "Hearken, O Disciples, I charge ye: everything that cometh into being, passeth away; strive without ceasing."⁽²⁾

The touchstone of Buddha's teaching was reason. His goal was truth. He wanted no one to believe him because it was his word. He was anxious that every one should exercise his reason and reach his conviction by the door of enlightenment. It is thus that he desired his disciples to reach the highest attitude of truth, the summit of human perfection; and this he emphasized with his dying breath: "Then spake the Exalted One to the Venerable Anand: 'Although this not the time for flowers, Anand, yet are these two twin

(1) *Mahavagga* I—6, 7, S. B. E. XIII.

(2) See Ch. VII ante 163.

trees completely decked with blossoms, and flowers are falling, showering, streaming down on the body of the Perfect One..... heavenly melodies are sounding in the air, in honour of the Perfect One. But to the Perfect One belongeth another homage, other reverence. Whosoever, Anand, male disciple or female follower, lay-brother, or lay-sister, lives in the truth, in matters both great and small, and lives according to the ordinance and also walks in the truth in details, these bring to the Perfect One the highest honour, glory, praise, and credit. Therefore, Anand, must ye practise thinking. Let us live in the truth, in matters great and small, and let us live according to the ordinance and walk in the truth also in details.' "(1)

It is no small credit to the Perfect One that he emphasized his disciples to discard the *ipse dixit* of an older faith in which even the smallest details of daily life—even the food to eat and the liquid to drink were stated to be Divine Commands. His dialectic method was essentially Socratic ; his objective was identical ; but the people whom he got inured to that method were wholly unaccustomed to exercise their reason. They had been born and brought up in a system which was professedly theocratic. To them the gods of the Vedas were real. To them they spoke through the medium of Brahmans. To them the thoughts, wrapped in a sacred tongue, were as the voice of thunder and the glow of the lightning. To them Buddha seemed to dissemble, when he denied his godly status. To them the voice of a man appealing to their reason was as strange as a lesson in differential calculus.

It is perfectly true that unlike Christ, Buddha claimed no exclusive relationship with God. He did not say to his disciples : " As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you " (2) " I am the way, the truth and the life ; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." (3) Nor did he say " If you had known me, ye should have known my Father also ; and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." (4) All this

(1) Oldenberg's *Buddh*—201. See
Ch. VII *ante* p. 162.

(2) *St. John* XX—21.

(3) *Ib* XIV—6.

(4) *Ib*. V—7.

rests on faith. If you believe—(a) that the statements imputed to Jesus were really made by him, upon which we have no testimony beyond that of the unlettered and credulous apostles and—(b) that ■ he made the statements, they must be true because their truth cannot be questioned, then Buddhism and Christianity are two things apart and it is idle to compare or contrast them because the truth of both cannot be tested by throwing them into the same crucible. Professor Williams sets out other points for contrast. But they run on the same line. For instance, he refers to the Christian doctrine of Original Sin, which he says Buddhism denies. But what evidence have we of its existence; and upon what rational basis can its denial be refuted?

Professor Williams descends into the particulars of the birth of the founders of the two religions. He says that while Jesus was born of a virgin who was conceived of the Holy Ghost ⁽¹⁾, the legend as to Buddha's conception is by no means anything so miraculous. The fact is that it is not miraculous at all. The fable of the white elephant associated with his birth is, of course, one of those vulgar encrustations upon the pure faith which have become attached to the founders of all creeds. The story is a pious legend connecting Buddha with his previous incarnation. To the same effect are the stories of his miracles which Professor Williams says are inferior to those attributed to Christ.⁽²⁾ But even so the Professor forgets the mentality of the two races and the compass of their imagery. He writes. "Then in regard to the miracles which both the Bible and the Tripitak describe as attestations of the truth of the teaching of each, contrast the simple and dignified statement that 'the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them' ⁽³⁾ with the following description of the Buddha's miracles in the *Maha Vagga* ⁽⁴⁾ 'At the command of the Blessed One, the five hundred pieces of fire-wood could not be split and were split,

⁽¹⁾ *St. Matthew*—I. 20.

⁽²⁾ *Buddhism*, p. 555.

⁽³⁾ *St. Matthew* XI—5.

⁽⁴⁾ I—20, 24; S. B. E. XIII—133.

the fires could not be lit up and were lit up, could not be extinguished and were extinguished.' Besides he created five hundred vessels with fire. Thus the number of these miracles amounts to three thousand and five hundred." As to this, all one can say, is that miracles being a manifestation of occult power, possession of the power is the only thing that matters ; to what end it was utilized depends upon the adventitious exigency of the moment. But in either case are we not taking too serious a view of the pious embellishments of the devout, —probably invented on purpose to popularize the creed by making a vivid appeal to the masses?

Then it is said that Buddha never rose from the dead but Christ did, to which we add a query. What evidence is there of it except the tainted evidence of the superstitious fishermen?

The apologists of Christianity must have, indeed, a very poor case if they regard these facts as the crucial issue in the two religions. Some other points are singled out which however call for no notice here. The Christian doctrine of resurrection is contrasted with the Buddhist doctrine of metempsychosis. But there is no scientific basis for either. And critics of Christianity point out that the single prophecy ascribed to Christ has been disproved by time. For had he not said " Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death till they see the son of Man coming in His Kingdom." ⁽¹⁾ Christianity, it is said, promises eternal life, while Buddhism holds out the dismal prospect of eternal extinction. Even if this be so, does the superiority of Christianity depend upon its promises and not upon its truth? And what evidence have we of the latter? The resurrection which the Christian scripture speaks of is the resurrection of the body: " And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." ⁽²⁾ In other words, Christ had prophesied an immediate

⁽¹⁾ *Matth.* XXVI—28. ² *Act* XXIV—15; cf. *Rev.* XX—13; *Jahn* V—29.

⁽³⁾ *2 Peter* 1:11-12, 13; *2 Rev.* XXI—1; XX—11.

resurrection on his second coming when the present heavens and earth, being not good enough for man to live in, will pass away, and give place to new heavens and a new earth and cast death and hell into the lake of fire. ⁽¹⁾ This new universe will be ruled by Christ who will be personally inducted into his everlasting throne by God himself. "Who shall come and shall not keep silence when He will vindicate Himself by an open signal, decisive, and final judgment which will make manifest to all men that verily there is a God that judgeth the earth."⁽²⁾ On this last day, the day of resurrection and the day of judgment, believers in Christ will be pardoned of their sins and received into the spiritual kindgom, while the unbelievers in Him will be consigned to perdition;" ⁽³⁾ "wherefore beloved seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of Him in peace, without spot and blameless." ⁽⁴⁾

Buddh never fed his disciples upon such large promises. He reminded them of the stern law of retribution. Be righteous and ye shall be saved. Be wicked and ye shall be damned. "All things are made of one essence, yet things are different according to the forms which they assume under different impressions. As they form themselves, so they act, and as they act, so they are. 'It is, Kashyap, as if a potter made different vessels out of the same clay. Some of these pots are to contain sugar, others rice, others curds and milk, others still are vessels of impurity. There is no impurity in the clay used; the diversity of the pots is only due to the moulding hands of the potter who shapes them for the various uses that circumstances may require. And as all things originate from one essence, so they are developing according to one law and they are destined to one aim—which is Nirvan. The great cloud full of rain comes up in this wide universe covering all countries and oceans to pour down its rain everywhere, over all grasses, shrubs, herbs, trees of various species, families of plants of different names growing on the earth, on the hills, on the mountains, or in the valleys.'

(1) *Rev.* XX—1.

(2) *Psalms* L—1-3.

(3) *2 Peter* 111-7.

(4) *Ib.* 111-14.

"Then, Kashyap, the grasses, shrubs, herbs, and wild trees suck the water emitted from that great cloud which is all of one essence and has been abundantly poured down, and they will according to their nature, acquire a proportionate development, shooting up and producing blossoms and fruits in their season. Rooted in one and the same soil, all those families of plants and germs are quickened by water of the same essence.

"Verily, I say unto you: Not in the heavens, not in the midst of the sea, not if thou hidest thyself away in the clefts of the mountains, wilt thou find a place where thou canst escape the fruit of thy evil actions.

'At the same time thou art sure to receive the blessings of thy good actions.'⁽¹⁾

But the divergences between the two religions are as nothing compared to the similarities which form the core of Christianity. Not only in its tenets, but equally in its form, method and practices, its rituals and institutions has the younger religion borrowed bodily from the older one. This is now acknowledged; but the unreserved acknowledgment is held by the devout to have shaken the foundation of Christianity with the result that undue emphasis is laid upon the divergences, it being pointed out that taken as a religion Buddhism is agnostic or even atheistic while the Christian religion is purely theistic and postulates the existence of and belief in a personal God.

Now as to the Christian God, what are the facts?

The Christian conception is admittedly a sublimated and purified concept, arising out of the common basis of all religions which were animistic, associating the presence of Divine power with certain prominent natural objects and phenomena e.g., hill-tops, ⁽²⁾ trees, ⁽³⁾ stones, ⁽⁴⁾ springs, ⁽⁵⁾ the fire, lightning ⁽⁶⁾ and the wind. ⁽⁷⁾ These forces and phenomena of nature were then

(1) Paul Carus: *Gospel of Buddha* 139.
142.

(2) 1 Samuel X-5, 6; 1 King III—2, 3.

(3) 1 Samuel IX—13; X—5; 1 Kings III—2, 3 Dent. XII—2.

(4) Joshua XXIV—26.

(5) Genesis XVI—14; XXI—30-33.

(6) Rigveda; Psalms XVIII—13, 14, 15.

(7) *Ib.*

personified, and the natural conception of God was anthropomorphic: "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day."⁽¹⁾ "He relished the smell of well cooked meat."

"And Noah built an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour....."⁽²⁾ He became known as the Jehovah and chose Moses to secure his peoples' loyalty to him, made a covenant with him and stipulated that he will destroy the altars of Baal and all other rival gods for he was 'jealous' of their rivalry.⁽³⁾ Moses took up the cudgels for his God and entered upon a long and obstinate struggle extending over the whole period of Israel's independence. All this was proceeding when Gautam Buddha was born. It is only in later ages that the conception of God was purified and a distinction began to be made between Jehovah and the ministers of his will—one of whom a son of King David, was exalted into his chosen Son, but his mission was to destroy unbelievers in the Jewish Jehovah: "Thou shalt wreak them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them into pieces like a potter's vessel"⁽⁴⁾ All heretics whether relations, widows or orphans were to be killed without mercy.⁽⁵⁾ A hope was given to the believers that God will appear and it was a living expectation in the first century B. C.⁽⁶⁾ The idea of sonship of God was still undeveloped. It was sometimes applied to the nation⁽⁷⁾ and at another to the Davidic King.⁽⁸⁾

These somewhat nebulous ideas were afloat when Jesus was born. He seized hold of them and declared himself the embodiment of the dual ideal. His idea of God was the Jewish idea with the vindictiveness left out. The Jews spoke of God as their Father to express the closeness of the relation between Him and Israel.⁽⁹⁾ Christ had borrowed from

(1) *Genesis* III—8.

(2) *Genesis* VIII—20, 21.

(3) *Exodus* XXXIV—10-14.

(4) *Psalms* II—7-9 *Isiah* IX—1-7.

(5) *Isiah* IX—17.

(6) *Murray's Bible Dict.* p. 313.

(7) *Exodus* IV—23.

(8) *2 Samuels* VII—14.

(9) *Psalms* c 111-12; *Isiah* LXIII—16.

the old Testament his title of "Son of Man" ⁽¹⁾ The doctrine of Trinity grew out of Christ's claim to be an incarnation of God; for it gave God a dual existence, God manifest, and God invisible to which was added a third element in the Godhead, namely the spirit of God, the Holy Spirit or the Holy Ghost, which represented the direct influence of God upon the human soul which Christ utilized as a "comforter" to his disciples till his resurrection. ⁽²⁾

It will thus be seen that so far as Christ is concerned, he added nothing to his revelation of God. His references to Him are casual and conventional. Thus: "God is a spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth". ⁽³⁾ Now if we turn to Buddhism, we find a similar dearth of informative references to God. His references to Him are critical, exposing as he does the ignorance of the Brahman to profess to know all about God. "Then you say, Vaseth ⁽⁴⁾, that not one of the Brahmans, or of their teachers, or of their pupils, even upto the seventh generation, has ever seen Brahman (the God of the Brahmans) face to face. And that even the Rishis of old, the utterers of the ancient verses, which the Brahmans of to-day recite so carefully in tone precisely as they have been handed down—even they did not pretend to know or to have seen where or whence or whither Brahman is. So that the Brahmans versed in the three Vedas have forsooth said thus: To a state of union with that which we know not and have not seen we can show the way and can say: This is the straight path, this is the direct way, which leads him who acts according to it, into a state of union with Brahman.

"Now what think you, Vaseth? Does it not follow, this being so, then the talk of the Brahmans, versed though they be in the three Vedas, is foolish talk?

"Verily, Vaseth, that Brahmans versed in the three Vedas should be able to show the way to a state of union with that which they do not know, neither have seen—such a condition

⁽¹⁾ *Danials* VII—13, 15; *Psalms* ■ *John* IV—24.
VIII—4.

⁽²⁾ *John* XIV—16, 26.

⁽⁴⁾ *Vaseth.*

of things has no existence. As when a string of blind men are clinging one to the other, neither can the foremost see, nor can the middle one see, nor can the hindmost see, just so is the talk ■ the Brahmins versed in the three Vedas.”⁽¹⁾ Words strong, but how true; words which have a wider application to the Brahmins, for there has been no religion since in which the founder has not professed to come direct from God and to know all about Him and yet how little have they said about it!

That Buddh should have been made the target of criticism because of his reticence about God shows to what extent the human mind is a prey to its own delusions.

⁽¹⁾ See *Pejja Sutta* S.B.E. 14, 15.

CHAPTER XIX.

BUDDHISM AND MODERN THOUGHT.

Buddh had prophesied for his religion only a longevity of five hundred years. A new Buddha was then to arise and proclaim a new gospel. Buddhism has outlived his prophecy and if we take its later modification and the assimilation of its tenets to Hinduism, the two religions combined extend their sway over half the population of the world. A religion of mere nescience and negation, of morbid pessimism and no hopefulness is not likely to have influenced so large a portion of humanity. Its pessimism may have appealed to the Indian mind with whose philosophy of despair early Buddhism was in accord. But that could not have been an attraction to the great Mongolian race, to the people of China and Japan who are by nature optimists, lively and inclined to make the most of the present and quite careless of the morrow. That such people should have clung to the gospel of despair cannot be explained away by the innate conservatism of the religious mind.

In the pre-Christian days when the Buddhist mission arose, crossed the mountains and braved the perils of the sea to propagate the Gospel, its influence in its overseas empire might perhaps be conceived as due to the enthusiasm and fervour of the missionary enterprise. But that fervour has long since died out. Buddhism is no longer a missionary religion, as are, for example, Christianity and Islam. Nor has it the same influential patrons as Christianity has and yet Buddhism has been holding its own in spite of the zeal and enterprise of the Christian Missionary. It has even begun to attract the Western mind where societies have been formed for its study, and its vast literature translated and studied with appreciation, in spite of the denunciations of the Church that it is rank atheism and gives no hope of eternal life. There can be no doubt that as compared to the attractions of Christianity and Islam, Buddhism offers nothing; while Christianity, offers

a resurrection and eternal life to all believers upon this very earth, the other takes you to the region of musk-houries whose saffron breath will never leave the faithful.

With all its adaptations and revisions, Buddhism is still a religion of earnest endeavour, selfless sacrifice and uncertain reward. But nevertheless its votaries, if not on the increase, are certainly not on the decline.

Even so sober a thinker as Huxley was struck by its vitality in spite of its drawbacks which the Romanes Lecturer thus described: "A system" he says, "which knows no God in the Western sense, which denies a soul to man, which counts the belief in immortality a blunder and the hope of it a sin, which refuses any efficacy to prayer and sacrifice, which bids men to look to nothing but their own efforts for salvation, which in its original purity knew nothing of vows of obedience and never sought the aid of the secular arm: yet spread over a considerable moiety of the old world with marvellous rapidity and is still with whatever base admixture of foreign superstitions, the dominant creed of a large fraction of mankind." (1)

But both in his method and ethics Gautam Buddha followed the process of Augustus Comte. His method was a positive scientific method, while his ethics is little distinguishable from his positive religion, though of course, it covers a wider field and is more akin to Christianity than to Comtism. Speaking of the latter's philosophy, George Henry Lewes wrote: "Every branch of knowledge passes successively through three stages,—first, the *supernatural* or fictitious; *secondly*, the *metaphysical* or abstract; and *thirdly*, the *physical* or scientific. The first is the necessary point of departure taken by human intelligence; the second, is merely a stage of transition from the supernatural to the positive; and the third is the fixed and definite condition in which knowledge is alone capable of progressive development." Comte's positive religion is based on the *cultus* of humanity considered as a corporeal being in the past, present and future, which is spoken of as the *Grand Etre*. His religion aims at the service and

(1) Prof. T. H. Huxley's (1893) *Romanes Lecture*.

ennoblement of this Great Commonwealth. That the Buddhist thought ran in the same direction and with the like objective makes his religion the patriarchal forerunner of all modern movements which have for their objective the service of mankind. So far and only so far Comtism and Buddhism are not only comparable, but at one.

The ethics of Buddha does not rest upon reason alone, though it can be fully vindicated by reason. He had himself rested it upon his metaphysics, though he confessed to his venture in that region as being incomplete. But it was nevertheless its shallow foundation, and if that goes, it will have nothing to rest upon, and will then hang in the air. His ethics cannot, therefore, be dissociated from his metaphysics; and the two make up his religion in the sense in which that term was understood in his day.

There are scholars who even to-day deny that Buddhism is a religion. The meaning of that term, so universal, and such a fruitful source of acrimony though at times it has become, has not yet emerged from the region of controversy. There are those who deny any creed to rise to the height of a religion which does not postulate the existence of a personal God. Even this alone would not suffice, since the protagonists of this view would reject as religion what denies to Him the supervising direction and control of man. Islam is such a religion, but Christianity has rejected it in theory and repelled it by force. And yet St. Thomas Aquinas defined it "as goodness rendering to God the honour due to Him" and as "the manifestation of that faith, hope, and charity toward God to which man is, above all, ordained." Sir John Seeley, the author of *Ecco Homo*, would give to that term a much wider scope as including "habitual and regulated admiration," or "worship of whatever in the known universe appears worthy of worship." While Frederic Harrison, himself a Positivist, defines it as "veneration for the power which exercises a dominant influence over life." While, according to Matthew Arnold, it is only "that voice of the deepest human experience," "morality touched with emotion."

That this was the view of the older theologians and divines seems clear from what Sparrow said in his *Sermons*.⁽¹⁾ "True religion in its essence and in kind is the same everywhere." Burnet in his *History of Religions*⁽²⁾ wrote: "That true religion is not contained in apparel.....singing and such other kinds of ceremonies; but in cleanness of mind," and Purchas in his *Pilgrimage*⁽³⁾ said:—"True religion is the right way of re-uniting man to God," while Milton in his *Paradise Lost*⁽⁴⁾ used it even in a wider sense: "The image of Brute adorned with gay religions full of Pomp and Gold." Cicero held: "Religion as the pious worship of God." According to James Caird, "Religion is mainly and chiefly the glorifying of God amid the duties and trials of the world, the guiding of our course amid adverse winds and currents of temptation by the sunlight of duty and the compass of Divine truth, the bearing up manfully, wisely, courageously, for the honour of Christ, our great leader in the conflict of life." But that this is too narrow a view of religion is emphasised by others. So Richter wrote: "Let us accept different forms of religion among men, as we accept different languages, wherein there is but one human nature expressed. Every genius has most power in his own language, and every heart in its own religions; religions are not proved, are not demonstrated, are not established, are not overthrown by logic. They are, of all the mysteries of nature and the human mind, the most mysterious and most inexplicable; they are of instinct and not of reason."

The term "religion" is, according to the New Oxford Dictionary, used in various senses—primary and secondary, literal and figurative; but those germane to the present subject are as implying (1) (a) recognition, on the part of man, of some higher unseen power as having control of his destiny and as being entitled to reverence and worship; (b) the general mental and moral attitude resulting from this belief with reference to its effect upon the individual or the community; (c) personal or general acceptance of this feeling as a standard of spiritual and practical life; (2) action or conduct indicating a belief in or reverence for and

(1) (1877) *Sermons* VII—90.

(2) (1679) I *Rec.* III—140;

(3) (1614) *Pilgrimages*.

(4) 1-372.

desire to please a divine ruling power ; (3) particular monastic or religious order or rule; and (4) a state of life bound by monastic vows. It is thus evident that we have not yet reached the stage of universal acceptance of its meaning. According to it our belief in the personal supreme God is the essential of religion ; but the moment we come to Theism that definition fails to assist us. Theism, they would say, is a doctrine, but not a religion. It is futile to pursue the inquiry any further. That the notion about religion differs not only from nation to nation and from age to age but from man to man adds further to the difficulty of reaching a common basis for speculation.

The ancient Greek regarded ethics as no part of his religion and religion as no part of his metaphysics. The Chinese of to-day is at once a follower of Buddh, Confucius and Tao. He uses all three without finding the least incongruity in their combination in his religion. As Sir Charles Eliot observes : " Europeans sometimes mention it as an amazing and almost ridiculous circumstance that an educated Chinese can belong to three religions, Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. But I find this attitude of mind eminently sensible. Confucianism is an admirable religion for State-ceremonies and college-chapels. By attending its occasional rites, one shows a decent respect for Heaven and Providence and commits oneself to nothing. And though a rigid Confucianist may have the contempt of a scholar and a statesman for popular ideas, yet the most devout Buddhist and Taoist can conform to Confucianism without scruple, whereas many who have attended an English Coronation Service must have wondered at the language which they seemed to approve of by their presence. And in China if you wish to water the aridity of Confucianism, you can find in Buddhism or Taoism whatever you want in the way of emotion or philosophy and you will not be accused of changing your religion because you take this refreshment. This temper is not good for creating new and profound religious thought, but it is good for sampling and appreciating the ' varieties of religious experience ' which offer their results as guides for this and other lives." ⁽¹⁾

(1) *Hinduism and Buddhism* XCVI—XCVII.

That conventional Christianity has itself undergone a radical transformation and is now in the process of rapid rationalization, placing its ethical principles above those of its dogma, is in itself evidence of the ever-widening conception of Religion. The Broad Church which includes among its members many distinguished and able men, owes its inception to the influence of the German rationalism and modern science. It influenced the views of such men as the late Dean Stanley, F. D. Maurice, Bishop Colenso, Stopford Brooke and the distinguished divines, Dr. Temple, afterwards the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Rowland Williams, Professor Jowett, Baden Powell, Mark Pattison, H. B. Wilson and the only layman C. H. Goodwin, who jointly lent their names to the remarkable book "Essays and Reviews" published in 1860 in which they advocated beliefs which have become the creed of the Broad Churchmen and other reforming churches: "They pay but little attention to either ceremony or dogma. They are for extending the liberty of belief within the Church to its utmost possible limits, as some assert, even to the borders of Unitarianism. They attach great importance to the social Christian virtues, to living a cleanly and wholesome life, adopting the precepts rather than the theology of religion."⁽¹⁾

That modern biological researches have begun to produce qualms of conscience even amongst the hierophants of the Church is only natural. Sir Aurthr Keith delivered his presidential address to the British Association on the 31st August 1927, upholding Darwin's "Theory of Evolution." It was followed by two striking sermons, delivered by Bishop Gore on the 18th September 1927, and by Bishop Barnes of Birmingham a few days later. Sir Arthur Keith's address is printed by the Rationalistic Press Association under the title "Concerning Man's Origin." Dr. Barnes, Bishop of Birmingham, in one of his sermons (since spoken of as the *Gorilla Sermons*) on the "Sacramental truth and falsehood" poured scorn on consubstantiation and transubstantiation, which he said, belonged to the realm of primitive magic and concluded by adding that there were always men ready to devise dexterous ways to defend superstitions of which

(1) Rev. E. D. Price: *The story of* Cf. Rev. W. E. Orchard: *The Present Origins in Religion.*
Religions 185.

they ought to be ashamed. In another sermon preached by the same Divine in Westminster Abbey, he exhorted his flock to welcome new discoveries with an open mind and revere the great men who made them, but not to yield to those who pretended to offer short cuts to faith. "Darwin's assertion," he continued, "that man had sprung from the apes,"—has stood the test of more than half a century of critical examination; increasing knowledge and careful inquiry have but confirmed its truth. ⁽¹⁾ As a result, the stories of the creation of Adam and Eve, of their primal innocence and of their fall, have for us become folk-lore. But by the men who built up catholic theology, they were accepted as solid facts.

"Darwin's triumph has destroyed the whole theological scheme. Many of us rejoice, for we regard the assertion that any Church is infallible as alike impudent and dangerous. It was contended by some that while man was physiologically a descendant of the apes, his mind was due to a Special Divine Act of creation. Such a contention cannot be upheld. Mental capacity and power are directly associated with the development of certain regions of the brain. The human mind has been derived by evolution from the intelligence of the lower animals, just as the human body has been evolved from the body of some primitive vertebrate. What biological inquiry has definitely established is—that much that is evil in man's passions and appetites is due to natural instincts inherited from his animal ancestry. In fact, man is not a being who has fallen from an ideal state of perfect innocence: he is an animal slowly gaining spiritual understanding and with the gain rising far above his distant ancestors. Further, it is quite impossible to harmonise this conclusion of scientific inquiry with the traditional theology of any branch of the Christian Church. The man of science admits his mistake without trying to conceal his retraction behind elaborate and evasive formulæ: the Churchman does well to follow his example.

(1) This sermon was delivered in October 1927 after Sir Arthur Keith's Presidential address to the British Association on the 31st August 1927 which revived the controversy on the descent of man

which Sir Arthur Keith said had now been clearly shown to be from Simian ancestry. (See his *Concerning man's origin* (R.P.A.) 12 seq.

"Already Christians, who are not obsessed by traditional theology, realise that the doctrine of evolution, leaves Christ's teaching unaffected. If there be a God behind Nature, He can show His creative activity through the process of emergent evolution just as definitely as by special creation. That He has used evil in His plan is obvious, and it puzzles us to reconcile this fact with His goodness and power. But there is no new problem herein. There is so much goodness in the world, such rich beauty, that we cannot believe that there is evil in the Creator Himself. His ends, we are forced to conclude, are not our own. His ideal man is not the animal, well-fed and luxurious, but the eager seeker for righteousness and truth.

"They should inquire whether personality survived bodily death and as it was a force which came ultimately from God, might they not reasonably hold that it would have an eternal existence and that God would preserve what was worth keeping? Certainly a time would come when the earth would no longer support life: and if there were no life beyond the grave, a philosopher from another planet would then conclude that in truth God had made all men for naught. On the whole, the modern scientific view of the origin of man's body and mind agreed well with Christ's teaching.

"Pseudo-religious propaganda is now more shameless," concluded Dr. Barnes, "superstition is more prevalent, sceptical orthodoxy more commonly joins hands with ignorant fanaticism. And so, true religion, the religion of the Spirit of Christ, is harmed. The reaction is intelligible, because war is demoralising. It breeds fear and contempt of truth and disregard of spiritual values. Let us be thankful that amid so much decay, science has preserved standards which organised religion has frequently failed to safeguard."

This is plain speaking; but it is the truth, in which Bishop Barnes had the support of Bishop Gore, who in his sermon delivered on the 18th September, 1927, in the Grotvenor Chapel, Mayfair, described the introductory stories of Genesis as mere folk-lore, and the Bible as containing "a vast deal of barbarism," with much of "mere fiction." "It is no good playing the

Canute," he said, "you must have the courage frankly to accept the indisputable verdicts of historical science." (1)

Other writers have given equally candid expression to a widely felt desire to build out of experience a working religion and a doctrine of God and Man with a sharp distinction between the spirit of God within, and the creative power of Nature. Its object is to show the unity of God and Man, and remodel Christianity by scrapping its dogmas and retaining only its ethics, (2) supporting it, however, by a revised notion of God which is as un-Christian because it is unanthropomorphic, as it is pro-Hindu because it is pantheistic. "The mystic finds God in all things and all things in God, for of Him and through Him and unto Him are all things to whom glory be for ever." (3) It is admitted that Christianity is a conglomeration of many faiths, while many of the Pagan myths, though devoid of any historic value, have found their way to Christianity, the most prominent of which is the development of the Eucharist and Mass.

The symbolism of the Churches is of long descent: "It is full of material which comes from Paganism, from forms of faith which, we who have borrowed their ceremonials and their actual attitude of mind, have no right to despise. There can be little spiritual difference between the Sacrament of to-day and the Mysteries of Greece. The gods have been changed, the myths and dramas of fertility have gone; the teaching of Jesus has been fitted in. But the cake of Eucharist is descended from the cake of Eleusis, and it came down by tradition from the slain animals and ultimately from the human victims whose blood fructified the fields. The harvest-thanksgiving was an ancient sacrifice. Christmas and Easter are Christianized forms of the Winter Solstice Feast and the Spring Festival. Let them remain; but let them be recognised for what they are. And let who wish be excused from joining them, and allowed to make new paths to a living God." (4)

(1) *Literary Guide*, Nov. 1927, pp. 191, *in man.*
192.

(2) John W. Graham,—"The Divinity

(3) *Ib.*
(4) *Ib.*

If we contrast Buddhism with Christianity, the contrast is one between Rationalism and Dogmatic Religion. Buddha had no misgiving about the heredity of man. His theory of cosmic evolution did not stage man as a fallen angel. He denounced the theory of special creation. He plainly perceived, by the light of his inspiration, the slow evolution of beings and he pricked the bubble of that complacent Egoism which deluded men into a false notion of his own immortality.

That Bishop Barnes' exegesis is an attack on the infallibility of the whole Bible is admitted by the Churchmen, one of whom wrote: "The Pharisees and the Sadducees believed in Moses, but rejected Christ; the modernists professes to believe in Christ, but rejects Moses. The two positions are equally untenable. The fact that man was made by God in His own image from the dust of the earth, as recorded in the book of Genesis, is referred to in every book of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation. All these books comprising the Bible are so inter-linked that they stand or fall together. Do away with the first Adam and his fall, and you must necessarily do away with the second Adam and the salvation wrought by Him. Do those, who disbelieve the history of Creation as set forth in the opening verses of Genesis on the strength of their scientific knowledge, not realize that they declare the whole Bible up to and including Revelation to be similar folk-lore?" The answer is,—they do, but it cannot be helped. Truth is truth and it will be out, and those who love truth for its own sake have nothing to fear, for they have nothing to shield. If they have to revise their faith, so much the better. It is not a matter for regret, but one for rejoicing. That this is the trend of modern theology admits of no doubt. That it was the basic principle of Buddhism only shows how far the founder of that religion was in advance of his age. The advance of science is the triumph of Buddhism: its fresh discoveries, its best vindication.

The question how far Buddhism answers the test of religion depends upon what is connoted by that term. As previously observed⁽¹⁾ there is no unity between nations or thinkers or

(1) Pp. 464-466 *ante*.

religionists themselves on the meaning of religion and still every body talks about it and, indeed, more blood has been shed in its name than in any other cause.

Taking, however, the term as implying a belief in a Supreme Creator Buddhism was never intended to be a religion nor did, indeed, Buddha attempt to found one. His teaching was purely practical. It was addressed to those who had pledged their faith in ceremonial observances and sacrifices, penance, and self-torture to the utter neglect of their social obligations. Buddha brought their minds from the cloudland of speculation to the arena of practical usefulness. If we remember the age in which Buddha lived and the society to which he addressed his teaching, it would be regarded as truly revolutionary. It was an age when one ruler regarded it his sacred duty to expand his kingdom by levying war upon his neighbours and in this he was encouraged by his religion; since the coveted horse-sacrifice (the *Ashvamedh*) was the one reserved for kings who had vanquished all their neighbours and it was the sacrifice which insured the translation of the performer to the coveted Paradise of Brahm. To teach to such people the true meaning of a sacrifice, the sanctity of human and, indeed, all life, to teach them the virtue of returning love for hate, to let them visualize the value of Renunciation was a task which till Gautam arose, was wholly beyond human comprehension.

It is true that Buddha did not go much beyond his immediate purpose, and so far as he was constrained to go, he regarded his essay as merely secondary and subservient to his main purpose. But even if it were otherwise, what did Buddha teach and how far has the world moved beyond his severe metaphysics? So far as the question of a personal God is concerned, do we not stand, to say exactly, as our forefathers did when Gautam analysed the concept and meaning of a Supreme Divinity? All he said is all that has been since repeated again and again. Even the most inspired religionists have not answered his query—What do we know

about Him ? We are told that God is life, He is truth ; “ the divine essence is love and wisdom ”⁽¹⁾ but does it advance us one whit in our knowledge and is it not true, as Dr. Young observed, that “ A God alone can comprehend a God ” ? It is true that man in all ages and in all stages of civilization has believed in a God and he cannot do without Him. But what is the origin of that belief ? Only this,—that the primitive man finding himself face to face with the forces of Nature and overawed by their great power and lustre began to worship them as gods and not being able to inter-connect them, he committed himself to polytheism ; and after a little more reflection that belief was purified and sublimated to a monotheism ; but when he was asked what did it all imply, he had no better knowledge of one than of the other, and the only escape from his dilemma lay in declamations and rhapsody. As O. W. Holmes remarked : “ We are all tattooed in our cradles with the beliefs of our tribe ; the record may seem superficial, but it is indelible. You cannot educate a man wholly out of the superstitious fears which were implanted in his imagination, no matter how utterly his reason may reject them.” But as Bacon observed : “ It were better to have no opinion of God at all than such an opinion as is unworthy of Him, for the one is unbelief and the other is contumely ; and certainly superstition is the reproach of the Deity.”

The fact is that a belief in a supreme power has become one of the heritages of mankind. It has passed from reason into the region of intuition. It is useless to argue with those who, being nurtured in the cradle of superstition, have their mental vision obscured by hereditary atrophy. And it is not wholly unreasonable that man should believe in the existence of a superior power, nor does its existence seem at all unlikely. But it is one thing to say that it exists and quite another to say what it is and in what way, if at all, it exercises its control over human life. Is it subject to its own laws or does it make laws only to infringe them ? There is the rub. And Buddha asked his disciples to refrain from inquiry into this

(1) *Swedenborg.*

unprofitable question. In doing so, he has at any rate the support of modern thinkers.

Renan in his "Studies of Religious History" had to confess : "To attempt to define and to show it to the sight implies an impossibility ; that is too clear to derive merit from saying it. All expression has a limit ; the only language which may not be unworthy of divine things is silence. But human nature does not resign itself to this. If man reflects in the presence of the mystery of the divine existence, he arrives, inspite of himself, at this question, would it not be better to leave these figures where they are, and give up the idea of expressing the ineffable ? It is not less certain that humanity, left to its instincts, is not swayed by any such scruple ; it prefers to talk imperfectly about God to remaining silent ; it likes better to trace a fantastic picture of the divine world than to resist the invincible charm which leads towards the invisible."⁽¹⁾ And when Buddh is charged with materialism let M. Renan answer : "It is through a serious misunderstanding that we charge antiquity with the reproach of materialism. Antiquity is neither materialistic, nor spiritualistic : it is human."⁽²⁾ And that is just what Buddh was and so was his religion. Buddh's method was the method of Auguste Comte : the result achieved was the result claimed for his positive philosophy. "Belief in invariable laws constitutes the Positive mode of thought which is the fundamental doctrine of true philosophy."⁽³⁾

To Comte, the universe was a vast magazine of unaccountable facts. Whence or how they came ? These facts we know not ; our business is to inquire into them as they are, and adapt ourselves accordingly. So it was to Herbert Spencer to whom the Absolute was not only unknown but was wholly unknowable. He points out how little the average man, even highly educated man, troubles himself about these questions. "There are many millions of people who daily see sunrise and sunset without ever asking what the sun is. And even among men of science there are those who, curiously examining the

(1) Ernest Renan : *Studies of Religious History* 49, 50.

(2) *Ib.* 290.

(3) J. S. Mill on A. Comte.

spectra of nebulae or calculating the masses and motions of double-stars, never pause to contemplate under other than physical aspects the immeasurably vast facts they record."

"By those who know much more, than by those who know little, is there felt the need for explanation? Whence this process, inconceivable, however symbolized, by which alike the monad and the man build themselves up into their respective structures? What must we say of the life, minute, multitudinous, degraded, which, covering the ocean-floor, occupies by far the largest part of the Earth's area and which yet, growing and decaying in utter darkness, presents hundreds of species of a single type? Or when we think of the myriads of years of the Earth's past during which have arisen and passed away low forms of creatures, small and great, have gradually evolved, how shall we answer the question—to what end? Ascending to wider problems,—in which way are we to interpret the lifelessness⁽¹⁾ of the great, of the greater celestial masses—the giant planets and the sun, in proportion to which the habitable planets are mere nothings? If we pass from these relatively near bodies to the thirty millions of remote suns and solar systems, where shall we find a reason for all this apparently unconscious existence,⁽²⁾ infinite in amount compared with the existence which is conscious—a waste universe as it seems? Then behind these mysteries lies the all embracing mystery—whence this universal transformation which has gone on unceasingly throughout a past eternity and will go on unceasingly throughout a future eternity? And along with this rises the paralyzing thought: what if, of all that is incomprehensible to us, there exists no comprehension anywhere? No wonder that man takes refuge in authoritative dogma!"⁽³⁾

Buddh was prepared to categorize what God was not. He was not the Brahm whom the Brahmans had painted as vindictive, blood-thirsty, corrupt, and cruel, requiring men to consign their bodies to lifelong torture and appease him by the slaughter of bulls and even human lives. Is such a god

(1) Why lifelessness? There may be life there as suitable to its environments.

(2) See *Supra*.

(3) 2 *Autobiography* 469, 470.

preferable to no God at all? It is feared that human nature has now become so saturated by the indoctrination of religions that he is unable to resist its influence. "He who hath not much meditated upon God, the human mind and the *Summum bonum*, may possibly make a thriving earthworm, but will most indubitably make a sorry patriot and a sorry statesman." As Washington remarked: "Religion is as necessary to reason as reason is to religion. A reasoning being would lose his reason, in attempting to account for the great phenomena of Nature, had he not a Supreme Being to refer to; and well has it been said, that if there had been no God, mankind would have been obliged to imagine one."

Buddh did not imagine a God when he found none deducible by his reason. He found in the universe the presence of great energy and power; but he equally found in its action no certain proof of a guiding hand. And as regards the affairs of man he found positive evidence of no guidance at all. He, therefore, charged his disciples to work out their own salvation and trust to no eternal agency for help.

In the quest for God, Buddh has been wrongly described as an atheist, though he was only an agnostic. He was atheistic relatively to the Brahmans for he did not believe in their Brahm and rejected their attributes of him as inconsistent with his high conception of a Supreme Creator. Buddh's view has never been superseded by modern speculation. Leaving out the view of the religionists who stand committed to the gods of their own religion, metaphysical speculation and scientific advance has not so far added anything to his reasoned conclusions. A generation ago, John Stuart Mill examined the question and his reasoned verdict has never been seriously questioned. He says: "From the result of the preceding examination of the evidence of Theism and (Theism being presupposed) of the evidences of any Revelation, it follows that the rational attitude of a thinking mind towards the supernatural, whether in nature or in revealed religion, is that of scepticism, as distinguished from belief on the one hand, and from atheism on the other, including (the present case)

the positive form of disbelief in a God, viz., not only the dogmatic denial of his existence, but the denial that there is any evidence on either side, which for most practical purposes amounts to the same thing as if the existence of a God had been disproved. If we are right in the conclusions to which we have been led by the preceding inquiry there is evidence, but insufficient for proof, and amounting only to one of the lower degrees of probability. The indication, given by such evidence as there is points to the creation, not indeed of the universe, but of the present order of it by an Intelligent Mind, whose power over the materials was not absolute, whose love for his creatures was not his sole actuating inducement, but who nevertheless desired their good. The notion of a providential government by an omnipotent Being for the good of His creature must be entirely dismissed. Even of the continued existence of the Creator we have no other guarantee than that he cannot be subject to the law of death which affects terrestrial beings, since the conditions that produce this liability, wherever it is known to exist are of his creating. That this Being, not being omnipotent may have produced a machinery falling short of His intentions, and which may require the occasional interposition of the Maker's hand, is a supposition not in itself absurd nor impossible, though in none of the cases, in which such interposition is believed to have occurred, is the evidence such as could possibly prove it, it remains a simple possibility, which those may dwell on to whom it yields comfort to suppose that blessings, which ordinary human power is inadequate to attain, may come not from extraordinary human power, but from the bounty of an intelligence beyond the human, and which continually cares for man.

“The possibility of a life after death rests on the same footing—of a boon which this powerful Being who wishes well to man, may have the power to grant, and which, if the message alleged to have been sent by Him was really sent, he has actually promised. The whole domain of the supernatural is thus removed from the region of Belief into that of simple Hope; and in that, for anything we can see, it is likely always to

remain ; for we can hardly anticipate either that any positive evidence will be acquired of the direct agency of Divine Benevolence in human destiny, or that any reason will be discovered for considering the realization of human hopes on the subject as beyond the pale of possibility.”⁽¹⁾

This was equally Buddh's view of the human soul. It was the very antithesis of the Vedantist dogma. To the latter what mattered was the cause, what did not matter was its phenomenal effect : “ Let none try to find out what speech is, let him know the speaker ; let none try to find out what visible subject, action, mind is, let him know the seer, the agent, the thinker.”⁽²⁾ But to the Buddhist, “ Anything whatever within, called soul (*Atta*) who sees, who moves the limbs etc., there is not.”⁽³⁾ This is allied to the Empiricism of Locke and the exact position of Hume (1711-1776 A.D.) who holds the Self or Ego as nothing else, in fact, than a complex of numerous swiftly succeeding ideas, under which complex, we then suppose placed an imaginary substrate named by us, Soul, Self, or Ego. The Self or Ego, therefore, rests wholly on an illusion ; and it is idle to think of its immortality ; since, being only a complex of our ideas, necessarily ceases with them. His speculation into the region of human consciousness had convinced him that there was no proof of the soul existing as an eternal principle in human body, and that human knowledge being limited by consciousness there was no means to predicate the existence of an entity that transcended consciousness. This too he would not emphasize, since he claimed to be a physician, who had come to heal the wound and not to answer questions—as those affecting the personality of him who inflicted the wound or the nature of the missile with which it was inflicted.⁽⁴⁾ The problem is equally the despair of modern thought.

Modern speculation, aided though it has been by the progress of modern science,—Astronomy, Geology, Biology and Physics—still remains sharply divided into two opposing schools

(1) *Three Essays on Religion*—Pt. 5; 242-244.

(2) *Kaushitaki rip.* III—8.

(3) *Samangal Vilasini* I—195.

(4) *Majjhima Nikay* I—426.

of those who deny the existence of the Ego as a non-spatial entity and those who assert that the discernible external actions of any organism cannot be explained without that postulate. The one regards the material universe a completely mechanical system, in which everything including the outward actions of human beings can be ascribed wholly to physical causes calculable ultimately in terms of the laws of motion recognized by Physics, regarding the brain and the mind as essentially one, each brain-state corresponding to a mind-state, and for any mental factor it being possible to assign a physical correlate. The other seeks to refuse the theory of psycho-physical parallelism, and while not denying the correlation still leaves a certain autonomy to the mind since the physiological action of a living organism of any sort can never be wholly explained by the ordinary principles of Physics or Chemistry, but presupposes some non-physical entity which controls the physical body in conformity with its purpose, unconsciously acting upon the body so as to regulate the latter in the interests of its life.

As Herbert Spencer writes: "No less inscrutable is this complex consciousness, which has slowly evolved out of an infinite vacuity, consciousness which, in other shapes, is manifested by animate beings at large—consciousness which, during the development of every creature, makes its appearance out of what seems unconscious matter, suggesting the thought that consciousness in some rudimentary form is omnipresent. Lastly, comes the insoluble questions concerning our own fate; the evidence seeming so strong that the relations of mind and nervous structures are such that cessation of the one accompanies dissolution of the other, while simultaneously, comes the thought, so strange and so difficult to realize, that with death there lapses both the consciousness of existence and the consciousness of having existed."⁽¹⁾ That was the psychological probability Buddha knew. But nevertheless there were even amongst his followers those who took more pronounced views on the subject and they ascribe to the Master the formal rejection of sixty-two views of the

(1) *Autobiography* 470, 471.

current doctrines as beyond the limits of legitimate research.⁽¹⁾ These views may be summarised into two main sub-heads : those that concern the past ; and those that concern the future. The former may be grouped under four sub-heads namely, (1) the views of the eternalists who believe in the eternity of the soul, established by alleged recollection of previous births or by reasoning and logic ; (2) partial eternalists : i.e., those who believe that the soul and the world are partially eternal and partially not. This is also sought to be proved by recollection ; (3) a third group regard the world finite or infinite, finite vertically or infinite horizontally or by reasoning conclude that it is neither finite nor infinite ; (4) the fourth group are mere sophists and depend upon logomachy and sophistry to prove the co-existence of the contraries—that the soul is both eternal and it is not ; that there is and there is not another world. Sanjai of the Belath is said to be the protagonist of this doctrine.⁽²⁾

Turning next to speculations relating to future life, the various views may be equally summarised into (1) eternalists who hold that the soul survives bodily dissolution, remains conscious, but they differ as to the nature of this soul, whether it has form or is formless, is both or neither, whether it is finite or infinite, both or neither ; as to whether it has limited or unlimited consciousness, both or neither ; (2) those who maintain that the soul is neither conscious nor unconscious after death, that it has form or is formless, both or neither ; (3) those who consider its survival conditional, dependent on the doctrine of Karm ; while the last group embraces (4) Nihilists and Atheists like Charvak who denied its survival. The fact is that the Brahmanical and Buddhist Sutras refer to every conceivable possibility from the eternalists to the rank materialists and there is nothing to shew that Buddha had identified himself with any positive doctrine. His clearly expressed view was one of agnosticism with a very slight inclination towards materialism upon which, however, he was

(1) *Digha Nikay* (Tr.) (1899-1921) (2) *Ib.* I—59.
S.B.E. II—IV.

definitely non-committal. And from the quotation last made this appears to be the trend of modern speculation voiced by the late Laureate in his memorable "*In Memoriam*" verses :

Behold ! we know not anything ;
We can but trust that good shall fall ;
At last far off, at last to all ;
And every Winter change to Spring.

But Buddha's imposition was rigidly logical and curiously it is identical with that assumed by modern psychologists. For instance, William James, the distinguished psychologist says : "The states of consciousness are all that psychology requires to do her work with. Metaphysics or theology may prove the soul to exist, but for psychology the hypothesis of such a substantial principle of unity is superfluous." Again later on he adds : "In this book the provisional solution which we have reached must be the final one : the Thoughts themselves are the Thinkers."⁽¹⁾ So Mr. Bradley has to admit that "the soul is a particular group of psychical events in so far as these events are taken merely as happening in time."⁽²⁾ And later on he adds : "The plurality of souls in the Absolute is, therefore, Appearance and their existence not genuine. Souls like their bodies, are as such nothing more than appearance....Neither (body and soul) is real in the end : each is merely phenomenal."⁽³⁾ And so Huxley referring to Berkley's idealism says : "What Berkley does not seem to have so clearly perceived is that the non-existence of a substance of mind is equally arguable....It is a remarkable indication of the subtlety of Indian speculation that Gautam should have seen deeper than the greatest of modern idealists."⁽⁴⁾ So, on the doctrine of existence, M. Bergson is prepared to make the Buddhist theory his own. In fact, he uses Buddhist phraseology in shewing that movement, change, becoming, is everything : no things that move and change and become.⁽⁵⁾

(1) Wm. James : *Psychology* pp. 203, 216.

(2) *Appearance and Reality* 298.

(3) *Ib.* 305—307.

(4) (1893) *Romanes Lecture*.

(5) "*The Philosophy of Change*."—
Wilson Carr,

Buddh's adoption of the Hindu theories of Karm and metempsychosis in aid to support his own doctrine, has not received the same consensus of support, though European metaphysicians, ancient or modern, are not wanting who would be prepared to support his doctrine through all its stages. Amongst the ancient philosophers, Plato, and amongst the poets, Virgil, have unequivocally supported belief in re-incarnation; while amongst modern thinkers—Goethe, Kant, Swedenburg and Lessing, Ibsen Herder, Lavator, Schopenhauer, Lichtenberg and Von Helmont, to mention only a few of the German philosophers, and Hume, Huxley, Bertholet and McTaggart of the British philosophers, and Wordsworth of the poets have. It is the solution suggested in the line of ratiocination adopted by Mr. Bradley: "The universe is incapable of increase. And to suppose a constant supply of new souls, none of which ever perished, would clearly land us in the end in an insuperable difficulty."⁽¹⁾ Speculation, ancient and modern, on this subject seems to have proceeded upon a narrow view of the universe, since it is invariably assumed that the recurrent must occur upon this planet, but are there not myriads of planets and stars of which we have only an infinitesimal glimpse and can it be predicated that inter-planetary transmigration is out of the question. Science as yet knows little or nothing of life outside the small and obscure orb which is a mere negligible speck in the starry firmament and if the theory has its other limitations, there is no reason to add one more without sufficient data.

Plato was a firm believer of both doctrines. He devotes to the subject a long and detailed dissertation; but his views are sufficiently indicated in the following extract: "But amongst all these, whosoever passes his life justly afterwards obtains a better lot, but who unjustly, a worse one. For to the same place, whence each soul comes, it does not return till the expiration of ten thousand years; for it does not recover its wings for so long a period, except it is the soul of a sincere lover of wisdom, or of one who had made philosophy

(1) Bradley: *Appearance and Reality*— 502.

his favourite.”⁽¹⁾ He then goes on to shew that the soul that has led a virtuous life is exalted to a higher life, but sordid souls pass into the life of a beast, and from a beast, he who was once a man passes again into man.⁽²⁾ Apart, however, from Plato and a few others, modern speculation does not support the theory of Karm which is now purely an Indian dogma, one which undeniably possesses a great moral value since it rewards and punishes a man and gives him some consolation and hope that he would be able to redress the wrongs of this life in the next. It makes man patient of human suffering and spurs him towards a nobler life.

The question—that man is not fully satisfied with this life, finds an echo in all religions, and the difference between them is one only of degree. The Christian hymnology bears ample testimony to the view that Christianity itself regards this world as vain and transitory, a vale of tears and tribulation; a troubled sea which we must cross to reach the haven of rest. It is a Buddhist metaphor. The Christian awaits the Day of Judgment and the fulfilment of a new heaven and a new earth. The Mahomedan hopes to heal his sores in the Garden of Allah. The gloomy view of life is not then the doctrine of Buddhism merely. It is true that Buddh lay much, perhaps excessive, stress upon life's sufferings, but he who worked for an ideal could not do less. At the same time, Buddh did not fail to realize the value of life. If he had regarded life as an unmitigated suffering, he could not have denounced self-destruction. The fact is, the moral teacher cannot be expected to observe uniform synthetical consistency. His words must be read not alone for what they express, but equally for what they imply. The sumtotal of Buddh's teaching was epitomized by the Emperor Ashoke in his edicts, in which he exhorted his people to exert to their utmost, practise piety and be compassionate to all sentient beings.

Buddhism cannot, then, be charged for being a melancholy faith and one which thwarts the display of

(1) *Phædrus* 61; I *Plato* (Bohn) 325; (2) *Ib.*

human energy. As has been well observed: "The opposition is not so much between Indian thought and the New Testament, for both of them teach that bliss is attainable, but not by satisfying desire. The fundamental contrast is rather between both Indian and the New Testament on the one hand and on the other the rooted conviction of European races, however much Christian Orthodoxy may disguise their expression of it,—that this world is all-important. This conviction finds expression not only in the avowed pursuit of pleasure and ambition, but in such sayings as that the best religion is the one which does most good, and such ideals as self-realization or the full development of one's nature and powers. Europeans, as a rule, have an innate distrust and mistrust of the doctrine that the world is vain or unreal. They can accord some sympathy to a dying man, who sees in due perspective the unimportance of his past life, or to a poet who under the starry heavens can make felt the smallness of man and his earth. But such thoughts are considered as permissible only as retrospect, not as principles of life. You may say that your labour has amounted to nothing, but not that labour is vain."⁽¹⁾ Similar view is voiced by Dr. James Sully in his work *Pessimism: a History and a Criticism*, and by Dr. Saleeby in an article contributed by him to the *Fortnightly Review* on "*The Survival Value of Religion*" in which he dismisses the future of Buddhism on the ground that "it was a mere pessimism" i.e., "since it preaches the worthlessness of life," it fails to have any survival-value for which a religion must enhance the value of life, taken in quality, if not in quantity."⁽²⁾

Apart, then, from the practical bias of the European mind there is no theoretical difference between his religion and Buddhism. The one ascribes human misery to the original sin, the other to the doer's misdeeds of the past. But neither takes full view of the inherent defect of human nature, or of the misery multiplied, if not originated, in the

(1) Sir C. Elliot's *Hinduism and* (2) (1906) *Fortnightly Review*,
 "LX, LXI.

self-assertive display of selfishness. Buddhism comes nearest to enunciating this doctrine. Apart from its doctrine of Karm, which is dismissed in this connection, Buddha takes his stand upon the principle that human misery is the resultant effect of human selfishness. It is the desire which is the root cause of all human misery and the Buddhist is exhorted to subdue it by constant practice. It is the keynote of his ethical exegesis. How does modern thought accord with his view? That self-control is the central figure in Buddhist teaching admits of no doubt. That it has only a secondary place in Western theology is equally clear. So in the Westminster Shorter Catechism (1647) we read: Question—I: "What is the chief end of man? A man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy Him for ever." To Buddha and Buddhism the mastery of desire was a self-evident proposition which could be proved by the school of daily experience.

There can be no difference of opinion on this elementary truth. But the difference arises when it is put into practice. Buddha had laid down a detailed scheme of monasticism and meditation; and these have become the subject of acute controversy. It has already been seen that only a few centuries after Buddha's death, monasticism was held to be by no means necessary for the practice of self-discipline, though meditation had always been commended as tending to compose and concentrate the mind upon the object in view. Plato held with Buddha that meditation brings the soul in contact with ethereal regions. He says, "For essence, that really exists, colourless, formless and intangible, is visible only to intelligence that guides the soul, and around it the family of true science have this for their abode. As then the mind of deity is nourished by intelligence and pure science, so the mind of every soul that is about to receive what properly belongs to it, when it sees after a long time that which is, is delighted and by contemplating the truth, is nourished and thrives, until the revolution of the heaven brings it round again to the same point. And during this circuit, it beholds justice herself, it beholds temperance, it beholds science,

not that to which creation is annexed, nor that which is different in different things of those which we call real, but that which is science in what really is."(¹)

Modern writers have equally endorsed the result of such meditation. So Fellham writes: "Meditation is the soul's perspective-glass, whereby in her long remove, she discerneth God, as if He were nearer at hand." And Jeremy Taylor says: "Meditation is the tongue of the soul and the language of our spirit; and our wandering thoughts in prayer are but the neglects of meditation and recessions from that duty; and according as we neglect meditation, so are our prayers imperfect, meditation being the soul of prayer and the intention of our spirit."

But modern thinkers are not equally agreed on the value of monasticism. It may, indeed, be generally asserted that in this respect Buddhism is the prototype of the Catholic monastic order. Both are pledged to celibacy, poverty and a life of most rigorous discipline. Both have the identical system of self-purification and self-discipline; but while Buddhism of the orthodox type recognizes no titular head of the Church, Roman Catholicism has adopted an order of religious hierarchy. The only comparison possible between the monastic system of Buddhism and Christianity is as the latter stood before its Reformation by the Lutheran movement initiated in 1517. That movement, though it was not directly aimed at the abolition of monasteries, resulted in their dissolution and it proved a death blow to monasticism throughout the Protestant Christendom. It had the necessary re-percussion upon the residue. Roman Catholicism survived the reforming zeal of the sixteenth century, but it emerged from the struggle severely maimed and weakened. Its most important abbeys and monasteries had to be closed down; the survivors suffered in patronage. This movement has given to Europe and America a religion more practical than thoughtful and Sir Charles Eliot thinks that there is as little chance of Christianity making a serious headway in Asia as there is of Buddhism

(1) *Phædrus* 58; 1 *Plato* (Bohu) 323.

becoming a national religion of Europe. The doctrines of the two religions appeal to minds temperamentally different. "Western ethics generally aim at teaching a man how to act: Eastern ethics at forming a character. A good character will no doubt act rightly when circumstances require action, but he need not seek occasion for action, he may even avoid them and in India the passionless sage is still in popular esteem superior to warriors, statesmen and scientists."⁽¹⁾

Long before the European monasteries were closed down by the Reformation, the Indian monasticism, even of the Hinayan school, had received a set-back in the liberty accorded to monks to withdraw from their vows and return to civil life. It had a demoralizing effect upon the Sangh, specially as the new entrant was sometimes promoted to be a Bodhisatv, after which he felt no incentive to continue to remain a stranger to his wife and children. In Nepal, as at one time in Kashmir, even celibacy was no longer insisted on. The monks in the modern monasteries whether Buddhist or Christian have ceased to be active missionaries, though their influence in the promotion of literacy and culture cannot be denied. Thus Buddhism has so far sacrificed its pristine rigidity of monasticism, and the idealism of the founder had to give way to the practical realism of every-day life.

Among modern thinkers Buddha could not have hoped for a more thorough-going supporter of his doctrine than Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860), the German philosopher, author of "*The World as Will and Idea*" (1819), "*The will in Nature*" (1836) and other works. He had vindicated the tenets of Buddhism in opposition to the idealism of the Hegelian philosophy. According to Schopenhauer, as according to Buddha, all willing comes from want and suffering; satisfaction is illusory; human life is endless pain, conflict, and struggle; the human virtues are but refined egoism, and only in the feeling of sympathy does the individual transcend his selfish isolation: sympathy is, therefore, the foundation for

(1) *I Hinduism and Buddhism* LXVIII.

all morality.⁽¹⁾ It must however, be confessed that in his effort to support his own pessimistic philosophy, Schopenhauer has exaggerated the pessimism of Buddhism and his writings have, it ■ feared, popularized the belief that Buddhism is unredeemed pessimism, ⁽²⁾ which, as will be evident from a closer study of its doctrines, it is not.

Apart, however, from the religio-metaphysical questions upon which Buddhism has led the way upon many points, the truth of which is becoming daily more apparent, the conclusions of modern science have in a striking manner confirmed some of the dogmas of Buddhist metaphysics. In this respect the speculations of the East and the West started from two opposite poles; but they have now me tat a point where Indian speculation started and European science has just arrived after centuries of vain struggle between dogmatic religion and inductive philosophy. Indian speculation started with the Supreme Creator and explained the creation of the universe as the handiwork of His Divine Will. It is His energy that permeates the universe in which worlds arise, grow and die. Everything is in a state of evolution and transformation. The moment a given phase is reached, it is transformed or ceases. In these perpetual movements, the present is not far, as the past is ending and the future has begun. In this never-ceasing career, material things are ever in a state of flux, ever-moving, subject to the same inexorable law of birth, development and decay. As such, the earth has its day of birth, its period of development and it is hastening onwards to its dissolution, following the course of worlds innumerable which have similarly arisen, grown and ceased to be. The history of the universe is repeating itself in the case of all living things. Like all celestial bodies they too come into being, grow and then dissolve. The law of perpetual motion is the cosmic law which equally applies to the vital principle in man. The soul of man struggling to purification

(1) See *Wallace Life* (1890); *Caldwell Criticism*; *Saleeby: The Survival Value of Schopenhauer's system* (1896); and the *of Religion*, Art. (1904) "Fortnightly Review."

(2) Sully: *Pessimism, = History and a*

and perfection finds in the body a suitable agent for its own refinements. If it uses it to that purpose, it will no longer need it and there would then be the cessation of re-births. If ■ uses it ill, it will irresistibly enter a baser form of life drawn by the magnetism of a baser mould.

This is the grand principle of evolution which modern science has only recently discovered in a shadowy form. Bruno was burnt alive as recently as 1,600 A.D. for daring to assert the plurality of worlds and for believing that the world is animated by an intelligent soul, the cause of forms and not of matter, that it lives in all things, even in such as seem not to live, that everything is ready to become organized; that matter is the mother of forms and then their grave, that matter and the soul & the world together constitute God.⁽¹⁾ Darwinism has not yet outlived its persecution by the Orthodoxy in America, caused by its upsetting the anthropocentric theory of special creation; though the scientific historian has to endorse the ancient Indian theory that the plan of the universe indicates a multiplicity of worlds in infinite space and a succession of worlds in infinite time, that Nature is transitory of living forms and man, a member of it, is subject to the same control of an eternal, universal, irresistible law, that the aim of Nature is intellectual development, seen as in the individual man as in the entire animated series and in the life of the Globe.⁽²⁾

The development of Buddhist Psychology falls into three stages. In the first place, we have the oldest doctrine imputed to Buddha himself. It was enlarged by Nagsen in his replies to King Milind; while it was further expanded by Buddhaghosh in his commentary known as the *Abhidharm*. But at each stage as the psychological exegesis developed, it became more and more artificial, till in the hands of its last expositor it ceased to be a science and passed into the domain of myth. The fact is that psychology could make no progress because in Buddha's days there was no study of biology. Medicine was no doubt studied; but it was studied without the aid of surgery, nor was

⁽¹⁾ H. Draper's *Intellectual Development of Europe* Ch. VI—pp. 257, 258. ⁽²⁾ *Ib.* Ch. IX-X.

surgery a popular science with those who decried the shedding of blood, with the result that the only materials available for the deduction of psychology were those available from observation and experience. And as these had to be reconciled to the three jewels—*Anitya* (impermanence), *Dukh* (suffering), and *An-atta* (No-Soul)—psychological speculation could not transcend that horizon. Hence Buddhist psychology, though an essential part of the Buddhist teaching became later developed into a dogmatic creed. So far as Buddha himself was concerned, he started with consciousness which he regarded as the equivalent of intelligence or mind.⁽¹⁾ To him that consciousness existed before birth and continued to exist after death, just as it continues before and after sleep. To the Buddhist, life and death are only incidents in the path of consciousness. So the Tathagat said "Were *Vigyan* (Consciousness) Anand, not to descend into the mother's womb, would body and mind become constituted therein" ?⁽²⁾ "To him, Bhikkus, who lives intent on enjoyment in things that tend to enfeeble us, there will be descent of *Vigyan*.....and where *Vigyan* gains a footing, there is descent of mental and bodily life.....for this nutriment, *Vigyan* is the cause of our taking birth and coming again to be."⁽³⁾

The self-same consciousness as it takes a new birth assumes a new *Namrup*—or name and form or a distinct visible entity. That the consciousness which is variously called, the Ego, the Soul, the Self, the *Atma*, the *Chitt* is distinct from the body is proved by the fact that the body is perishable, while consciousness is not. ⁽⁴⁾ They are "merely names, expressions, turns of speech, designations in common use in the world. Of these he who has won truth makes use indeed, but is not led astray by them." ⁽⁵⁾ The *Namrup* comprises five *Skandhs* ; ⁽⁶⁾ a term, which though meaning "aggregates," comprises the material qualities, such as feeling, sense-perception, and consciousness

(1) (*Chittam iti pi iti pi Vigyanam*) *Digha Nikay*, I—213 ; *Anguttara Nikay* I—170.

(2) *Digha Nikay* : (Dialogues of the Buddha), II—60.

(3) *Samyutta Nikay*, II—13, 91, 101.

(4) *Vinay Texts*, I p. 100.

(5) *Digha Nikay* I—263.

(6) *P. Khandhas*.

often spoken of as the five and sometimes the six senses, ⁽¹⁾ the seat of which was said to be the heart and not the brain. Consequently, the word "*Chitt*" was taken to connote the heart as well as consciousness. The consciousness is prompted by the *Skandhas* and is ever changing; but there ■ no mind apart from consciousness to receive or control it. That consciousness and those senses were affected by impact with the ever-changing, ever-mobile outer world, compounded of the countless syntheses of the four elements, the extended, the covering, the colorific and the mobile. The difference in contact created the difference in the senses of feeling, perception or volition. The external world was assumed as real and not a mere *Maya* or illusion, as it was held to be by the Vedantist Seer. Nor was he prepared to postulate the existence of an *Atman* or Soul in his sense. To him the five senses received their impressions and these impressions remained independent: "These five senses, brother, have different fields, different ranges; they do not share each other's fields and ranges. Of them thus mutually independent, mind is their resort, and mind partakes of and enjoys the field and range of them all." ⁽²⁾ The mind is a passive recipient of the sensations; it is not an active agent even when the sensations produce pleasure and pain. Since "because of some tendency there arises perception, opinion, thinking, volition, wish, aspiration. And according as the tendency is low, mediocre or lofty, so will all these be." ⁽³⁾

The later developments of psychology have taken the course already set out.⁽⁴⁾ *Dhyan* and *Samadhi*, a form of Yoge, was grafted on to the Master's teaching. The mind, which has so far remained in a fluid state, was recognized as a distinct non-spatial entity. Its concentration and direction gave occasion for the elaboration of a system which, though loosely termed psychology, has really no relation to it. It is true it claimed to lead to the discernment of the inter-relation between mind and body ⁽⁵⁾ but it did so by the acquisition of supernatural power and thought, as descriptive of the function of the mind

(1) The sixth being the mind—*Samyutta Nikay*, V—218.
Nikay IV—1, 15, 25, 87.

(2) *Samyutta Nikay* II—153.

(3) *Majjhima Nikay*, I—295; *Samyutta*

(4) *Dialogues* I—86.

■ would be rightly treated as psychology, still it is not a subject which has yet obtained the *imprimatur* of science. It will be found set out under another head. ⁽¹⁾

Orientalists lay emphasis upon the fact that Buddhism has made notable contributions to logic. That Gautam Buddha was an empiric logician and that he did not go beyond his intuition in formulating his doctrine seems to admit of no doubt. But as his doctrine became wide-spread and attracted a large circle of savants they naturally occupied their time in developing and illustrating it, by reducing its tenets to the form of metaphysical and logical discourses. Before the advent of Buddhism, logic was not unknown. As a matter of fact the Nyaya philosophy is logic. But it recognised four sources of knowledge, namely, (1) perception, (2) inference, (3) authority, and (4) comparison. This was opposed by the Charvaks (Atheists) who denied that there was any source beyond perception.

Buddhism made a first attack upon these extreme views by repudiating the value of authority and reducing it to the level of inference, and by rejecting comparison as an independent source of knowledge. It equally opposed Charvak's repudiation of inference as a source of knowledge, perception and inference. The first noted Buddhist logician known to fame is Dignag who is said to have flourished about 400 A.D. His works in the original are lost and are now available only in their Tibetan rendering. To him a concept was not a mere perception but a series of perceptions cemented with the force of imagination. Having thus analysed a concept he proceeds to emphasise the value of inference which is the product of the mind. He was the first to evolve the theory of syllogism by defining the middle term as essential for logical ratiocination. This term he called *Hetu* which he defined and postulated as essential for a logical inference. Another logician of note was Dharm Kirti who is said to have lived about three hundred years later. His work on *Nyaya Bindu* further develops Dignag's theory of perception which he showed as valueless without the background necessary of mind, to co-ordinate and assimilate the

(1) See Ch. XIII pp. 365-368,

sensations by reducing them into genera and species for the purpose of adding to our stock of knowledge. To him a syllogism had the dual aspect, first as a demonstration of truth to oneself and secondly its value in demonstrating it to others. It is only for the latter purpose that he justifies the multiplication of premises. Otherwise, he is content with the simpler form expressed in the oft-quoted illustration—"The hill is fiery, because it is smoky," which the modern logician would reduce into the following syllogism :—

There can be no smoke without fire,
This hill is smoky,
Therefore, it is fiery.

Ādharm Kīrti postulated the three-fold basis of inference, namely, identity of nature or essence, effect of the cause, and non-perception or non-existence. In this he differed from the orthodox Naiyāyikas who regarded observation as the sole basis of knowledge. The Buddhist logicians had anticipated Mill in their invention of five-conditioned method (*Pancharni*) with a view to establish causal connections, (1) the perception of neither cause nor of the effect, (2) the perception of the cause, (3) the perception of the effect in immediate succession, (4) the disappearance of the cause and (5) the disappearance in immediate succession of the effect.

The modern ethical theory branches off into at least three inter-related but distinct lines of thought. The divergence between the ethics of reason and the ethics of sensibility was too sharp to be logical, and an intermediate line of cleavage had to be found in the ethics of personality, variously classed Perfectionism, Eudæmonism or Energism. The first presupposes that human beings are naturally rational and the true life is that which conforms to the rule of reason. The older philosophers such as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics and Kant, the Neo-Kantians and the Intuitionists in modern times still stand by the doctrine of pure reason; while their opponents expound the opposing creed of Hedonism which rejects the mastery of reason, though they regard it as the servant of feeling, a minister to be always consulted and listened to with

respect and confidence, but still a minister only and not a ruler in a party conflict of the soul.

Upholders of this view such as the Charvaks, the Cyrenaics and Epicurians, in modern times supported by Hobbes, Bentham, Hume, the two Mills, Bain, Spencer presuppose human nature to be dominated by emotion, though it is and must be tempered by reason. As was to be expected these generalities were considered too sweeping and Eudæmonism seems to strike a middle course by recognizing the rights of reason and the rights of sensibility and reduce them to the unity of a common life governed by a single central principle. The protagonists of this doctrine are Plato and Aristotle, Hegel, and the Neo-Hegelians such as Green, Caird, Mackenzie, Muirhead, Dewey, Seth, Paulsen and others. The Upanishads are inclined to Eudæmonism while Buddha was an uncompromising Rationalist. In modern academies he would stand by the side of Plato, Aristotle and Kant rather than the Hedonists or Hegel. And as the three schools are still running a close race for supremacy, it cannot be said that Buddha's ethics has in any degree suffered in its force or cogency with the passage of time.

The fact is that there is not much difference in the views of three schools: the difference is one of the degree of emphasis laid upon reason or sensibility. Buddha was not a theorist and while his system was rigidly rational he did not obscure his vision to the call of sensibility and his ethics accords with the kernal of the teachings of modern evolutionary sociologists. But unlike them, his vision is not circumscribed by the human horizon of pleasure or pain or the narrow doctrine of human utility, since his teachings enlarge the bounds of human thought and extend the compass of human action. To him this globe is only a tiny atom in the universe, in which the human actions neither begin nor end, but which offers a splendid field for the display of one's faculties, but their effect is never lost but persists and becomes impressed upon living matter as it passes through the various stages of evolution in the ever-changing panorama of the world.

The growth of old sciences and the emergence of the new, has made no marked contribution to the elucidation of the metaphysical problems upon which the modern speculator and the scientist remain equally divided. The problems to-day remain the same as confronted Plato, Pythagoras and Gautam Buddha and the solutions offered have made no advance upon those suggested by inspiration or ratiocination. All attempts to correlate what is known of the growth of the nervous system with the evolution of intelligence, only go to show that structure and function have developed together, and to each distinguishable type of natural mechanism there is found correspondingly a new type of knowledge. Our organs do not perceive but we cannot perceive without them. But whether we can see because we have eyes, or have eyes because we see, whether the structure or the function is logically prior—can never be known and is left to the metaphysician to argue.⁽¹⁾ Biologists of this school have no means of going beyond the theory of psycho-physical paralleism. To them the material universe is a completely mechanical system in which everything, including the outward actions of human beings, can be ascribed wholly to physical causes calculable ultimately in terms of the laws of motion recognized by physics, while at the same time leaving a certain undetermined autonomy to the mind.

There are, however, those who claim to have shown that the physiological action of living organisms of any sort can never be wholly explained by the ordinary principles of physics or chemistry, but presupposes some non-physical entity which controls the physical body in conformity with (presumably unconscious) purposes.⁽²⁾ For instance, it is asked, how can we explain the physiological side of an act of recognition, which on the mechanistic view consists in striking on the same trace which was left in the brain by a previous perception, recurring in quite a different context and, therefore associated with a different part of the brain? "There is an individual relation between stimulus and effect in man when he acts.

(1) Sir John Parsons: *An Introduction to the theory of Perception* (Camb.)

(2) Prof. Hans Driesch: "*Mind and Body*" 56-64, 147, 148.

That is, stimulus and action correspond with each other in a quite peculiar way as *wholes*, but they do not correspond part by part in all their component parts. Either of those wholes (stimulus or action) can be presented in many different forms which have no resemblance to each other; on the other hand, quite insignificant alterations within a whole can radically alter the whole as a whole. This kind of correspondence between action and stimulus, taken by itself, contradicts every kind of mechanical theory; and there has also to be added, as we know, that the physical thing 'man in action' is made what it is in its capacity for action by all the facts of its history. But this infinitely variable order of action is far from being lawless; it is, indeed governed by special and very strange laws, which science as such will never be able to formulate except in a very clumsy and imperfect manner."⁽¹⁾

Professor Driesch combats the mechanist theory by several arguments which can only be very briefly summarized here. His work is too condensed to be intelligible to the lay mind; but to the student of Psychology, his reasoning would appear plausible though not unanswerable. For instance, when he refers to the effect produced on the mind by a speech in any language, he argues that while to our sense-organs as a physical fact the perception of each word, whether in French, English or German, produces a corresponding stimulus on the brain, the response on the mental side is to the speech as a whole, *i.e.*, while every word produces a different sound and therefore a different stimulus, yet the ultimate response will be the same. If then it is said, the brain is conceived mechanically, our mental life cannot possibly stand in a strict relation of a correspondence to it; since, in order that the two things should correspond, their structure must be parallel, and therefore, of the same kind, which is not the case here. Mechanism treats the whole merely as a resultant of its separate parts, the new merely as a re-combination of the old without any qualitative difference, but this whether true of

(1) Prof. Hans Driesch: "*Mind and Body*" 58, 59.

the matter or not is certainly not true of the mind. If ■ were otherwise, there would be no room for invention and new thoughts.

The fact that man can reason and evolve new thought gives ■ quite a different set of relations from the spatial and causal ones which constitute our brain. Further, while matter has only three different kinds of constituent elements, positive electrons, negative electrons and ether,⁽¹⁾ and only three different kinds of motions, the mind is infinitely more manifold. This view does not proceed beyond attacking the theory of parallelism. But it does not make for the existence of mind as a non-spatial entity, though its existence is then taken for granted or held established presumably by a process of exhaustion. It is, moreover, clear that since all entities and acts concerned are themselves non-spatial, it is a parallelism between mind in different capacities—the mind conscious, and the mind acting unconsciously on the body.

(1) Prof. Hans Driesch: "*Mind and Body*" p. 80.

CHAPTER XX.

BUDDHISM AND MODERN PROGRESS.

Civilization is said to be the art of living together. As such, Buddhism has unquestionably been the pioneer in civilizing the world. Consider the position of the world before its advent. India was divided into warring states, its people into conflicting sects. The social order recognized no obligation towards society. The religious tenets tended to destroy it by enlarging upon its inutility and worthlessness. Man was exhorted to shun social contact, avoid its entanglements, despise its attractions and fly from it as from a burning house. This being the ideal of life, it permeated all classes of society. The king was a mere tax-gatherer, the proceeds of which he utilized for his self-aggrandizement. The defences of the country were neglected and the frontier passes were an open door for the trans-border marauder. The Indian lived not the life that is, but only endured it for that to be and indeed, even as a ladder for its absolute extinction; he was assured that all life was an evil and that the process of re-births was a penalty for past misdeeds. It need scarcely be added that such a melancholy view of life could not but fail to create an atmosphere of personal detachment and despair in which self-development and the growth and development of the social order were alike out of the question. On the other hand, a man's existence was a continuous struggle against its continuance and every means of accelerating its termination was treated as a pious act and a commendable virtue. It is in this state of social chaos that Buddhism was born, and while it gave even a wider currency to the pessimistic view of life, still the fact remains that in spite of its pathetic pessimism, it inculcated other principles and enforced rules which resulted in creating a cementing bond in society, in promoting its solidarity and discords which went far to weld the people of India for a time into as near the conception of a nation as it has ever been before or since, and to

make its government a national government and one which has made the reign of Ashoke and his successors a golden chapter in the history of India.

As Mr. Havell observes: "The student of Indian history may also be led to consider whether the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, constituted as it now ■ on more or less empirical lines, is really more efficient as political machinery than was the philosophic scheme of Indo-Aryan polity, in which the common law of the land, formulated by the chosen representatives of the people, had a religious as well as a legal sanction, and represented the highest power of the State to which even the king and his ministers must bow. It will be a surprise to many readers to discover that the Mother of the Western Parliaments had an Aryan relative in India, showing a strong family likeness, before the sixth century B.C., and that her descendants were a great power in the State at the time of the Norman Conquest!

"The great thinkers and social reformers of India, beginning with the Buddha, grasped firmly one of the eternal verities, generally ignored in Western Politics, that ideas, good or evil, are more potent than armaments—for the spirit survives when the body is destroyed. It is, therefore, no less important for the State to purge the body politic of evil-thinking than it is to stay an epidemic or provide efficient means of national self-defence. For that reason, the philosophical debating-halls, in which king and commoner met on terms of equality, always played a more important part in Indo-Aryan politics than Councils of War, Acts of Parliament, or Royal Edicts and for the same reason the political education of the Indian masses in the Dark Ages of European history was probably far better than that which obtains in most European countries in the twentieth century!" (1)

That the condition of the peasantry and the people in those days was far better than that of their confreres in the West to-day is, Mr. Havell concludes, equally attested by

(1) Havell (E. B.): *The History of Aryan Rule in India* (introduction) XIII—XIV.

the facts of history. He says: "When Indo-Aryan law and order prevailed in India in the long centuries before the Mahomedan invasions, the economic and political status of the Indian peasant was certainly far higher than that of the English peasant of the twentieth century, if the description of the latter's condition given by Mr. Maurice Hewlett may be considered approximately true: 'robbed, pauperised, terrorised, mocked with a County Council of landlords, a district Council of tenant-farmers, and a Parish Council without powers.

"The British factory-hand and dweller in city slums sings when he goes to war, because war is for him a release from servitude and misery, often far more degrading than the Indian caste-system at its worst. He does not sing in times of peace. He is then chained down to a daily life in which there is no joy of freedom—the slavery of modern industrialism. He struggles vainly to free himself from it by the organization of trade-unions and only adds to the political machine another form of tyranny which often is a menace to the whole imperial fabric. The co-operative trade and craft guilds of India helped the workman to enjoy life, gave him self-respect and fostered his technical skill, and at the same time served religiously the interests of the State.

"Now that it is so common to impose literary shibboleths as final tests of culture and political capacity, it is interesting to observe that at a time when India had reached the zenith of her creative power in arts and letters, a position at least as high as that reached by any modern state, she had achieved a system of self-government probably as perfect as the world has yet known."⁽¹⁾

What, it may be asked, led to the breakdown of this system which insured the well-being of the multitude, for which the twentieth century Europe still yearns? Mr. Havell ascribes it to the idealism of Buddh and post-Buddhist idealists who carried their principle—that right is might, and as the *Mahabharat* puts it, "The heavens are centred in the ethics

(1) Havell (E.B.): *The History of Aryan Rule in India* 168—169.

of the State," to the point of neglecting their defences, with the result that the famished and truculent hordes from the Western hills poured down into the fertile plains of India and taught the people, when it was too late, the lesson of blood and sword. Buddha had himself been the witness of the ruin of his own Shakyas and his disciples had neglected to reckon with those who, driven by hunger or fired by ambition, had put to the test their own view of ethics, antagonistic to the doctrinaires who, in their philosophic zeal, had failed to appraise the value of theories as modified by the stern law of necessity.

How far Buddhism is responsible for or contributed to the stagnant civilization of the East has often been raised but can never be satisfactorily answered. That religion does materially influence a people's outlook on life and gives a directing force to their energies cannot be disputed, but in this respect Christianity and Buddhism are both identical in their condemnation of wealth and the praise of poverty. Both systems were communistic in their origin and enjoined celibacy on the part of their monks. But the fact that the West has forged ahead inspite of the one can be no argument that the East has remained stationary because of the other. Japan though Buddhist now ranks in the van of modern progress, while there is a notable awakening amongst the other Asiatic nations whose renaissance is coupled with the revivalism of their religion. The question whether Buddhism of the latter day has not hampered human progress is, of course, another matter. That it has yielded to the sword of the Saracen is undoubted. That it is an ill preparation for the conquest of the savage or the repelling of brute force is equally undoubted. But so is Christianity. The fact is that the primitive instinct of man ■ lust for conquest, pelf and power. Our Simian refinement does not wholly rule out the love of lucre. And human wars and human exploitation will continue though their evils might be moderated, but they can never be eradicated by the salving balm of religion. Climate, necessity, hunger, the influence of diet and example, national and racial temperament, the instinct

of self-preservation, and numerous other factors move men's minds, which cannot for ever be curbed by the Appealing grace of religion, which may control the evil instincts in some men, curb them in others, but can never bring a millennium when the lion will be happy to lie down with the lamb. These are the limitations of all religions. They must remain the limitations of Buddhism.

That Buddhism became, in some degree, responsible for the establishment of the Mahomedan rule in India seems to admit of no doubt; since the deadly conflict between the Brahmans and the Buddhists was directly responsible for the downfall of Harsh's empire. And the disappearance of that Empire was only a symptom of the general downfall of the Hindu ideals which, in the competition of the rival systems, failed to offer a united resistance to the foreign aggressor, who quieted the disputants by putting their wranglings to the arbitrament of the sword. Islam, like the Law of Buddha, was a rule of life, but unlike Buddhism it was content to take the world as it is and provided for the happiness of average humanity. It did not care to improve humanity or engage itself into the transcendental depths of arid metaphysics. It was content to leave men as men and possessed no ambition to raise them to the spiritual height of saints. The doctrine of Buddhist ideal in its age-long struggle with the forces of Brahmanism exhausted its strength, deteriorated its ideals, debased its rituals, and confused its clear-cut issues. The severe asceticism of the Bhikkhus has at once been the source of its strength and weakness. The monasteries which had been richly endowed by the devout became the refuge of indolence, and a haven of dissolution. The incursion of the foreigners which had appeared and disappeared like a periodical cyclone, became more frequent and persistent.

"The conquest of Sind by the Arabs was made easy by the fact that thousands of male population had adopted the yellow robe for the sake of the easy life of the monastery. They were not like the monks of Naland and other great seats of Buddhist learning, for they were accounted as idle,

dissolute fellows who had no regard for their own reputation or for the rules of their Order. The monastic system continued to absorb a large proportion of the flower of Indian manhood even after the development of Brahman philosophy added Buddhism to the Hindu synthesis, for every great Hindu temple which was built meant the dedication of public or private funds for the maintenance of priests, temple-servants, Brahman students and their Gurus, Sadhus and Sannyasins. And it was the period from the seventh century to the time of Mahmud of Ghazni which was the most prolific in religious building—a time when Hindu monarchs vied with each other in the magnificence and number of their temples, when sacred hills were converted into cities of gods, and whe. hundred of thousands of skilled artisans were diverted from ordinary industrial pursuits to the pious labour of elaborating the embellishment of the temple-service in stone, bronze, precious metals, and costly fabrics. This was an occupation which the Western political economists regard as extravagantly wasteful and unprofitable when they compare it with the modern 'progressive' system which condemns millions of men, women, and children to the intellectual and moral degradation of factory labour, and employs the highest intelligence of the nation in the invention and manufacture of engines of destruction. The mediæval system, however unscientific and wasteful it might have been, was abundantly productive. The amazing accumulation of wealth stored in Indian temple-treasuries more than anything else excited the cupidity of the Mahomedan invaders and made their pious predatory raids highly profitable undertakings."⁽¹⁾

Modern metaphysics finds no ratiocinative data for upholding the theory of either Karm or its sequent transmigration. It was probably invented as a moral hypothesis intended to buttress the ethical doctrine of mundane inequality of the distribution of pleasure and pain which seems to be otherwise fortuitous and to follow no inflexible law. Nor has modern

(1) Havell (E. B.): *The History of Aryan Rule in India*—259.

metaphysics been able to discover any fresh data for upholding the existence of a supreme ruling power. It still remains an article of faith. But it rejects the Vedantic assumption that the world is a mere passing show, a phenomenon without an underlying reality. It however, concedes, as it must, that our knowledge is determined by the gauge of our apperception and is, therefore, necessarily limited.

Though modern thought has in theory acclaimed the highest ethics of Buddhism and Christianity, it regards them both as obsolete in practice, and as a counsel of perfection. There are, no doubt, still a few adherents of the old doctrine who, though unable to attain its unattainable heights, do still endeavour to reach the summit, but the masses remain uninfluenced by its non-egoism. But nevertheless their spirit has gone far to curb the savage propensities of man; and the world would have been very different and much the worse but for the exalted morality which has on many an occasion guided the course of history. Little do we know how much we owe to the impulses of those religions for our social amelioration. It was not a mere humanitarianism which ensured the abolition of slavery. It was not innate charity which has provided the world with asylums, hospitals and poor-houses. Oriental hospitality is a by-word, but it has not arisen from the teachings of the Academy but is the direct offspring of religion. If we turn to the life of Ashoke and those who preceded him, we shall gain some insight into the healing balm which Buddhism has left as its legacy to alleviate human suffering. We are still far from the millennium and the numerous bloody wars which blot the pages of history, the selfish ambition and pretence of nations, great and small, amply testify to the over-mastery of human passions by the Moloch of selfishness against which the inculcations of Buddhism and Christianity have been alike powerless.

It might be a wonder that the innate pessimism of the Buddhist dogma and the sweet reasonableness of its ethics and metaphysics should have evolved a system which made the king the father of his people, induced him to scorn the lust of

power and conquest, and ennobled his conception of duty as the father of the people, nay, of all sentient life, which he strove to protect by building roads, and constructing rest houses thereon, digging wells to quench the thirst of way-farers, building hospitals for man and beast, endowing monasteries, universities and public lecture-halls, remitting taxes to those who had consecrated their lives for the service of man, and above all inculcating the duty of service of man towards his fellow-beings. The life of Ashoke is the life of one who had imbibed the spirit of Buddhism. He had been a tyrant and blood-thirsty usurper of his father's throne, but no sooner did he become a convert to Buddhism than he promptly realized the error of his ways and acted up to the sublime teachings of his Master—that man should not live to serve his own private ends and as Buddh had sacrificed many a life in his previous births for the sake of others, he should be ready to do the same.

Brahmanism had established the institution of caste; Brahmans had appointed themselves as the sole accredited intermediaries between man and God; they alone had professed to possess the key to paradise. To them the people were as pawns in their game of self-deception and self-aggrandizement. Buddhism entered the lists with them by proclaiming to the world the unity and equality of all life. Its founder denied that salvation was in the keeping of Brahmans; he asseverated the worthlessness of sacrifice as the only high road to salvation. To him the equality of all men was an article of creed but against which the Brahmans showed a sullen hostility. To him the intervention of the priestcraft was the noose of a designing charlatan. He denied that God would be propitiated by the sacrifice of life. He refused to believe in the revelation of the Vedas or in their infallibility or supremacy. He placed his own reason above the sacred writing. The Brahmans had maintained that authority by sedulously preaching to the credulous and ignorant proletariat their own supremacy. Buddh was a Kshatriya and other Kshatriyas before him had challenged their pretensions. But no sooner was their opposition found formidable by the Brahmans, than they were promptly

admitted by the Brahmans into the charmed coterie ■ Brahmanism. Several centuries before Buddh, Vishwamitra, who like Buddh was a member of the royal clan, had to storm their citadel of exclusiveness; but Brahmans had compromised with him and he and his family had been acknowledged as entitled to the priestly privileges. King Janak of Videh had equally refused to submit to the pretended supremacy of the Brahmanical hierarchy and claimed his right of offering sacrifices without the intercession of priests. He too had been propitiated and Yadnyavalkyd and other Brahmans had acknowledged his supremacy.

But these had been isolated cases of men who had fought for the recognition of their own right, or that of their family or clan. These early struggles mark the growing rivalry between the priests and the ruling house for supremacy both in the fields of politics and religion. While the Kshatriyas challenged the claim of the clergy to God's vice-regency on earth, the Brahmans retaliated by challenging the authority of the Kshatriyas to the monopoly of temporal power. The struggle between the two classes does not appear to have attained the bitterness which it afterwards did though before Gautam's birth, it was still raging. Professor Max Muller adverts to this rivalry. He says: "There is a dark chapter in the history of India, the reported destruction of all the Kshatriyas by Parash Ram. It marks the beginning of the hierarchical supremacy of the Brahmans. Though the Brahmans seem never to have aspired to the royal power, their caste, as far as we know the history and traditions of India, has always been in reality the ruling caste. Their ministry was courted as the only means of winning divine favour, their doctrines were admitted as infallible, their gods were worshipped as the only true gods and their voice was powerful enough to stamp not only the simple strains of the Rishis, but the absurd lucubrations of the authors of the Brahmans, with a divine authority. After this last step, however, the triumph of Brahmanism was preparing to fall. In India, less than in any other country would people submit to the monopoly of truth; and the same millions who were

patiently bearing the yoke of a political despotism, threw off the fetters of an intellectual tyranny. In order to overthrow one of the oldest religions of the world, ■ was sufficient that one man should challenge the authority of the Brahmans, the gods of the earth (Bhudev), and preach among the scorned and degraded creatures of God the simple truth that salvation was possible without the mediation of priests, and without a belief in books to which these very priests had given the title of revelation. This man was Buddha Shakyamuni."⁽¹⁾

But it must not be supposed that the social revolt led by Gautam went on unopposed by the priest-craft. At this distance of time, it is not possible to gauge the acrimony or intensity of the opposition which the Brahmans offered to the new cult. But a reference to the contemporary Brahmanical writings shows that the apostles of the older religion left no stone unturned to malign and suppress the heretical religion which threatened their very livelihood. The following denunciation of Kumaril is only characteristic of the class to which he belonged. He says, "These Shakyas, Vaisheshikas and other heretics who have been frightened out of their wits by the faithful Mimansakas, prattle away with our own words as if trying to lay hold of a shadow. They say that their sacred works are eternal, but they are of empty minds, and only out of hatred they wish to deny that the Ved is the most ancient book. And these would-be logicians declare even that some of their precepts (which they have stolen from us), like that of universal benevolence are not derived from the Ved, because most of Buddha's other sayings are altogether opposed to the Ved. Wishing, therefore, to keep true on this point also, and seeing that no merely human precept could have any authority in moral and supernatural subjects, they try to veil their difficulty by aping our own arguments for the eternal existence of the Ved. They know that the Mimansakas have proved that no sayings of man can have any authority on supernatural subjects; they know also that the authority of the Ved cannot be controverted, because they can bring forward nothing against the proofs adduced for

(1) *History of Sanskrit Literature*—81, 82.

its divine rights, by which all supposition of a human source has been removed. Therefore, their hearts being gnawed by their own words, which are like the smattering of children, and having themselves nothing to answer, because the deception of their illogical arguments has been destroyed, they begin to speak like a foolish suitor who came to ask for a bride, saying 'My family is as good as your family.' In the same manner they now maintain the eternal existence of their books, aping the speeches of others. And if they are challenged and told that this is our argument, they brawl, and say that we, the Mimansakas, have heard and stolen it from them. For, a man, who has lost all shame, who can talk away without any sense, and tries to cheat his opponent, will never get tired, and will never be put down!" (1)

This is not an isolated diatribe, for other writers have lampooned the founder of the new-fangled creed with unsparing venom, to which the Buddhists, though sorely tried, offered no retaliation. They went on with their work of consolidation and proselytization with the result that the masses crowded to their banner, and the new creed, though seriously hampered in its mission, triumphed over its detractors and gave India the master-key of social synthesis. It reinforced the peoples' power of self-help and self-reliance and infinitely widened the horizon of their service, sacrifice and sympathies, with the result that places, which had been only a few decades ago howling wildernesses, were converted into smiling landscapes dotted with viharas, seminaries, dispensaries, and rest-houses for all comers not excluding the dumb creation. It may be doubted whether after the lapse of more than two thousand years, a modern state exists anywhere in the world, where the Government are doing more, or even as much as the Buddhist kings did for their people. European writers readily admit that under the sway of Buddhism, India was in the meridian of history. (2)

Now ■ we take ■ hurried view of other countries—the only view possible in a work of this scope and dimensions—we

(1) Quoted per Max Muller: *History of Sanskrit Literature*—84, 85.

(2) Max Muller: *History of Sanskrit Literature*—34.

find that the most advanced Asiatic countries contemporaneous with Buddhist India were China and Persia in the East and Greece and Rome in the West. So far as China is concerned, it had already a venerable civilization of its own before it came into contact with the new dispensation : and in view of the fact that Confucianism and Taoism were stirring up a social revolution when Gautam was doing the same in India, all that can be asserted with any degree of confidence is—that judging from the voluminous literature evolved out of the comparatively scanty materials borrowed from India, that country must have been considerably influenced by it.

Turning next to further West, it will be seen that the only countries of whose civilization we have any record are Greece and Rome. Of these the former had influenced the latter. Like the Indians, the Greeks were instinctively pessimistic. The philosophy popular with them was the philosophy of Lucretius and the Stoics and not that of the Epicureans. They always felt that they were in the presence of unknown, incalculable powers and that subtle danger lurked in human achievements and gains :

Man finds no fact too hard or high ;
Heaven is not safe from man's desire.
Our rash designs move Jove to ire.
He dares not lay his thunder by.

The Greeks like the Brahmans believed in a variation of Karm which they called Moira which meant a fixed and an immutable order in the universe and a fact to which all men are subject and against which it was useless to contend. Human progress towards perfection, towards an ideal of omniscience, or an ideal of happiness, would be the breaking down of the bars which separate man from God. If it were not irreligious, it was impossible. The life to lead was then of resignation—a life incompatible with the notion of progress.⁽¹⁾ But this was the Greek temperament before the Macedonian conquest. “ In the later period of Greek history, which began with the conquests of Alexander the Great, there had emerged the conception of the whole inhabited world as a unity and totality, the

idea of the whole human race as one.”⁽¹⁾ This new view became impressed not only upon the Greeks, but also through them upon the Romans, whose theoretical justification was found in their large empire subject to a common order, which the poets in their patriotic glorification designated the world. With the advent of Christianity, this idea was given a wider currency ; but Christianity had itself borrowed it from the Greeks. It will thus be seen that the narrow conception of the Greek world, extended after Alexander’s conquering campaigns, became crystallised in the Greek conception of life and gave to it a new meaning and a larger span in the scheme of creation. It may be reasonably surmised that Alexander had seen this new idea in practice in India where for several centuries it had been both preached and practised. Buddhism may then justifiably claim to have materially, and in one respect radically, revolutionized the theory of life in Europe and so far it may justly claim to have been the pioneer and disseminator of a new idealism which has leavened the social life of the world.

But it is not its only contribution to civilization. Strabo records the fact, borne out by the Sanskrit writers, that Brahmans had rigidly excluded women from being participators in the knowledge of their metaphysics ; their reason being that if women were let into the secret, they would no longer remain the slaves of man. It is true that they had to join their husbands in making sacrifices, and it is equally true that some venturesome women like Maitreyi had partaken of the forbidden fruit, but these were the exceptions and not the rule.

The position of woman in Greece was no better, if it was not actually worse, and a similar position of subordination was assigned to the Roman matron. Buddhism was the first to fling open its doors to women and it is a fact which those who have visited Buddhist countries like Burmah will testify to—that women there up to the present day enjoy their rights and privileges, some of which are yet not conceded to their Western sisters. Their marriage is a contract dissoluble at will. They

(1) Bury (J. B.), *The Idea of Progress*— 15-19. (2) *Ib.*—23.

retain their rights of property and independent residence, while to them, as to men, education is both free and universal. They are held under no restraint by man. The latter, if anything, is under their domination both in business and at home. And these women have enjoyed their complete emancipation since ages past. Where else in the wide world do women enjoy such equal rights?

As regards mass education, it is only within the last half century that some European countries have made it free and compulsory. Secondary and university education is not yet a charge on the State. But in India with the advancing wave of Buddhism, all education was made free and the country was studded with universities, of which two—those at Nalanda in Behar and Taxilla near Rawalpindi—had acquired wide celebrity. They were equipped with all faculties of learning, while Taxilla had specialized in Medicine.

The University of Nalanda was founded by King Chakraditya soon after the death of Buddha and it was enriched by the munificence of his successors, including a King of central India and other places. It was the royal observatory, and taught its pupils both religion and secular sciences, such as Mathematics and Astronomy. Its water-clock, says Hiuen Tsiang, gave correct time for all Magadha. Attached to this and other universities were schools of arts and crafts, for both Buddhist and Brahman monks were skilled in sculpture and painting of icons and in temple-decorations, though the latter would generally look with contempt upon secular handicraft.⁽¹⁾ Its name and fame had reached far distant countries such as Tibet and China, as there, in the year 750 A.D., the king had sent an embassy to invite its High Priest Kamalsila (728-776 A.D.) a specialist in Tantra to visit Tibet to combat heresies and bring about a renaissance of Buddhism. Nalanda at one time boasted of ten thousand priests and students. The priests were also professors in the university. Only advanced students were admitted; those seeking admission being required to satisfy

(1) Havell (E. B.): *A Study of Indo-Aryan Civilization*—141.

the test prescribed by the *Dwar-Pandit*, i.e., the gate-keeper of the Board of Admission. Hiuen Tsiang records that the entrance examination was severe and only about two or three out of every ten applicants succeeded to pass it.⁽¹⁾ The subjects taught therein comprised both religious and secular knowledge. Students were free to learn both Brahmanical as well as Buddhist text books. It produced a succession of profound scholars. There were separate chairs for each subject. The university was equipped with an incomparable library which the Mahomedans destroyed, and what was saved from their vandalism, was destroyed by fire.

The University itself seems to have suffered a set-back by the foundation and growth of the neighbouring university of Vikramsila. It appears that this university founded in the eighth century A.D. became at first a sister-university to Naland which it, however, soon eclipsed both because of the superiority and newness of its buildings as also because of the zeal of its patrons who favoured their own foundation.

Nothing remains of this great seat of learning except a few bare walls and a long range of lofty mounds, and a few tanks at Dargar,⁽²⁾ a desolate dusty station on the Bihar-Bakhtiapur Light Railway eight miles from Rajgir.

The other University at Taxilla, at one time a great city beyond the Indus and now represented by more than twelve square miles of ruins to the north-west of Rawalpindi, was, as already stated, another seat of a great university, famous for its medical faculty. Its site is now marked by a great stup 100 ft. high built by Ashoke and the ruins of numerous buildings which surrounded it. ⁽³⁾ Unlike Naland which lay sheltered in the interior of Behar, Taxilla stood at the gate-way of India, and as its sentinel it was constantly exposed to the shocks from a succession of foreign invaders, so much so that within a period of a thousand years since the fifth century

(1) 2 *Western Records* 170, 171.

(2) Cunningham calls it "Bargaon"—*Ancient Geography of India* 498.

(3) Sir John Marshall's *Guide to Taxilla*

(Calcutta) 1921 gives an account of these ruins; *Ib. Annual Report 1914-15 of the Archaeological Survey of India*—1-41.

B. C., it fell under the sway of no less than seven different nations, namely, the Persians, the Macedonians, the Mauryas, the Bactrian Greeks, the Shakyas, the Parthians and the Kushans. The city had long been in ruins when Hiuen Tsiang visited it in 629 A.D. (1) so that its university must have had a briefer spell of prosperity than its Naland sister.

The present writer had recently visited the sites of both Taxilla and Naland. Excavations on a large scale were proceeding in the former, and they have already yielded numerous relics, which Government have collected in a museum recently constructed for the purpose, and which is well worth a visit. Inspection of the site reminiscent of the ruins of Pompeii, shows that while the bare walls of the houses of a thriving large city were still visible, mostly in a state of preservation, there was no building which could be connected with academic life; nor has anything yet been discovered, which might be described as a relic of an ancient seat of learning. All the same, the ruins testify to the existence of a large well-ordered city with its city walls, streets and the royal court set off by the adjoining fields, which form a splendid background.

The ruins of Naland are different. Here there is no trace of a town, but everything points to the existence of a great Vihar or a monastic university. There are still the uncovered walls, the court-yards, the towers and minarets, the innumerable monk cells, the wells, and everything that points to the existence of a great institution. Here also a small museum recently erected exhibits the relics collected from the ruins. The ruins clearly mark the existence of two structures, one super-imposed upon the other, and, it is believed, that on the destruction of one university, another was constructed on the same foundations, which also in course of time disappeared. In both places the remains bear witness to the spacious grandeur of a by-gone age, when wealth and learning must have combined to maintain the great foundations, to which were attracted students and scholars even from far-off countries such as Tibet and China.

(1) *Western Records*—137.

Besides these great seats of learning there were other universities which only live in name. All these conferred various degrees, granted diplomas, held debates, and prize-competitions, awarded literary titles, promoted research, and their professors compiled works which were copied and distributed far and wide. Side by side with these advanced institutions, there were numerous universities in which the young man received his training.

Distinguished *alumni* from these great universities carried their learning and enthusiasm to the distant parts of the land, founding other universities not now so well-known to repute. Nagarjun, the Brahmin student of Naland and afterwards protagonist of the Mahayan sect, founded the university at Suddhanya Katak.

On the headwaters of the Krishna river, Ajanta, of which the caves and the frescoes are still extant, was the seat of another university founded about the second century B. C., compared to which the University of Vikramsila was quite recent, being founded by King Dharmpal in the eighth century A.D. It existed in Behar somewhere on the bank of the Ganges, according to General Cunningham in what is now Silao, a small village near Bargaon in the Patna district ;⁽¹⁾ but this is by no means certain, as other sites have been equally identified, Pathargata near Colong in the Bhagalpur district being one.⁽²⁾ The university had six gates each in charge of a distinguished Pandit who held a preliminary test examination for admission to the University. Each of these gate-keepers were presumably in charge of one branch of learning, though Vikramsila appears to have specialized in Tantric teaching. Three thousand monks resided at this University.

We have record of two smaller Universities—one at Buddh Gaya with a thousand monks, and another at Udanpuri with the same number. All these Universities disappeared and their monks scattered or slaughtered with the Musalman conquest of Behar. Bakhtiar Khilji destroyed Vikramsila

(1) ■ *Archæological Report* 83.

Basistchandra : *Indian Logic* : Medieval

(2) N. Dey (1909) *I. A. S. B. Jang* : School p. 150.

about 1203 ; and the following account given in the history of that period known as the *Tabakat-i-Nasiri* ⁽¹⁾ commemorates that event : — The greater number of the inhabitants of that place were Brahmans⁽²⁾ and the whole of those Brahmans had their heads shaven ; and they were all slain. There were a great number of books on the religion of the Hindus there ; and when these books came under the observation of the Musalmans, they summoned a number of Hindus that they might give them information respecting the import of those books ; but the whole of the Hindus had been killed ; on becoming acquainted with the contents of those books, it was found that the whole of that fortress and city was a college, and in the Hindu tongue, they called a college—" Bihar."

Further east, another University had come into existence which likewise fell to the sword of the barbarian. King Rampal of Bengal who reigned from 1084-1130 A.D. founded the city of Ramavati on the banks of the Ganges in the country of Barendra, identified with northern Bengal. Here he constructed a new University which he named the Jagatdal Vihar. It had a short life, being destroyed with the rest only after a century of its coming into existence.⁽³⁾

Education was from all time free to all and open alike to the clergy and the laity. It was the pride of kings and the captains of industry to perpetuate their name by founding chairs or otherwise embellish these temples of learning. Buddhist India was dotted with monasteries and they were so numerous in Bihar that the province itself became so known.

The decay of Buddhism in India did not destroy the culture which it had imparted. On the revival of Hinduism, the monasteries were converted into Hindu *muths*, but they soon ceased to diffuse mass education. They still survive —most of them in Southern India ; but they have ceased to kindle the light of reason and are the whitened sepulchre of orthodoxy and the dogma of an obsolete creed.

(1) Maj. H. G. Raverty's Tr. (1881) 552.

(2) He meant " Bhikkhus".

(3) Universities of Ancient India (1908) *Journal of the Buddhist Text and Research Society* Vol. VII 21.

How far the spirit of Buddhism has influenced the course of modern history can only be a matter of intelligent conjecture. But he who reads that remarkable work by Sebastien Mercier, published in 1770, in which he describes the state of civilization in A.D. 2,440, cannot fail to detect therein the presence of a kindred spirit who ascribed the causes of men's misfortunes as due to themselves. "Man is governed by natural invariable laws, and he has only to study them to know the springs of his destiny, the causes of his evils and their remedies. The laws of his nature are self-love, desire of happiness, and aversion to pain. These are the simple and prolific principles of everything that happens in the moral world. Man is the artificer of his own fate. He may lament his weakness and folly : but he has perhaps still more reason to be confident in his energies when he recollects from what point he has set out, and to what heights he has been capable of elevating himself."⁽¹⁾ If this is not Buddhism what else is it? And it was a potent cause of the French Revolution (1789 A.D.).

And Mercier was not the only apostle of the new cult. Fourier attempted to co-ordinate facts in the moral world as Newton had, before him, co-ordinated those in the physical world. He argued that human passions have hitherto been the sources of happiness. So far he was on the right track ; but when he concluded of self that it was possible to reconcile self-indulgence with a similar passion in others, he fell into the error from which he found no escape except through the quagmire of an absurd utopia. In order to reconcile the mutually repellent forces of selfishness, he proposed to alter the whole structure of society by enlarging the compass of family as a social unit of about 1,800 persons who were to live and own property in common. Fourier believed in metempsychosis, and, like Pythagoras, he could recall the past. His ontological view is a weak reflex of Buddhism, but it was nonetheless its direct outcome.⁽²⁾ It enabled him to found a sect which had a considerable body

(1) L'am 2,440 ; Bury (J. B.) *The Idea of Progress*—Ch. X, 192-201.

(2) *Theoria de L'unite universelle*.

of devoted followers. Beranger acclaimed his "discovery" and, according to an English writer, "the social theory of Fourier is at the present moment (1847) engrossing the attention and exciting the apprehensions of thinking men, not only in France but in almost every country in Europe."⁽¹⁾

France is to modern Europe what Greece was to the ancients, a nursery of new ideas, a clearing house of the old. No history of human progress can ignore the great intellectual movements of which France was the trumpeter. Her cry for "Liberty, Equality, and Universal Brotherhood" became a passionate appeal to the people, only after she had shaken off the incubus of religion as the sole dictator of society and imbibed the new spirit diffused by the Encyclopaedists and those great idealists whose cardinal creed scorned the hope of resurrection and put in its place the service of man. Candorcet, and after him St. Simon, and his lineal successor Auguste Comte, were dreamers, but dreamers whose dreams were soon translated into blood and iron. Men seldom act unless their idealism becomes the main-spring of action. They are incapable of concerted action until the proletariat begins to see it in a vision and begins to feel its abiding presence.

In the world's great movements it is not the result so much as the preparatory stage upon which due emphasis is justly laid by the historian. That epoch in a nation's history must take account of the national temperament created or modified by multitudinous causes, natural and adventitious: climate is one of them, religion another. The influence of climate and soil has been often underrated, if not over-looked, in tracing the evolution and development of society. The force of an idea has not been always appraised at its true value. You may kill the idealist, but you cannot destroy his idea which persists and only dies when its vitality is spent. Nay, if it embodies even a germ of Truth, it is wholly indestructible.

(1) Quoted per Prof. Bury in *The Idea of Progress*—231.

The French Encyclopædists had passed current the supremacy of reason as superior to the dogma of religion. It tended to light a fire in which conflicting ideas were tested. The dross perished, but the pure gold emerged shining and bright, purified and burnished by the impact of heat of that furnace. In this great conflict which culminated in the French Revolution and is transforming the thoughts of all Europe, little account is taken of the self-same problems which, over two thousand years before had confronted the sage of Kapilvastu who had given to the world an accurate analysis of human psychology, and with it a solution for the establishment of a new order in which the larger vision of life was portrayed in colours, which the Western savants have not even yet been able to view in the full light of that rationalism which to the thinking mind is the only dependable lodestar.

To St. Simon, as to Gautam, the goal of human development is happiness. But how is that goal attainable? to the myopic vision that goal lies in the immediate environments of life. To him the only environment is the universe. St. Simon, and his disciples had dimly foreshadowed the attainment of social perfection by the construction of a system⁽¹⁾ the details of which were left to his disciples,—Olinde Rodrigues and Enfantin, to develop. They founded a Journal in 1825, the *Producteur*, which advocated the formulation of a new general doctrine as essential for the regeneration of society. The cardinal doctrine of this school was that the society of the future must be socialistic: "The new social doctrine must not only be diffused by education and legislation, it must be sanctioned by a new religion. Christianity will not serve, for Christianity is founded on a dualism between matter and spirit, and has laid a curse on matter. The new religion must be monistic, and its principles are, briefly: God is one, God is all, that is, all is God. He is universal love, revealing itself as mind and matter. And

(1) (1814) *D'la reorganisation de la Société Européenne III.*

to this triad correspond the three domains of religion, science, and industry." (1) This is the *Advait* philosophy of the Vedantist, re-discovered in France—an old idea worked out with all its details, of which a seed cast on the high-way of ancient Europe lay dormant for ages, till it was wafted by the wind to take root in the congenial soil of modern Europe.

As previously stated, Comte, and before him Turgot had enunciated the Law in three stages, i.e., when the natural phenomena were explained by the intervention of the deities, by abstractions, and finally culminating in their explanation by scientific methods of observation and experiment.

Judged by this test, Buddha was not only the earliest exponent of the new social system, but he was equally the first in the field to elaborate it. It was he who first proclaimed the equality of man, their fraternity and universal brotherhood. It was he who first declaimed the worthlessness of sacrifice to the gods and taught man the value of social service. It was he who emancipated man from the thralldom of religion. It was he again, who released man from the iron heel of a confederacy of priests. And it was he who first told man to exercise his reason and be not the dumb driven cattle meekly following the dogma of religion.

In spite of its vaunted civilization and culture, Europe is only now awakening itself to its heavy incubus which the intelligentsia and the working classes are alike trying to shake off. It is perhaps a sign of the times that the two great revolutions in recent years have both been anti-religious, that is anti-Christian. The French Revolution swept away Christianity as a State religion, and the Russian Revolution has been even more hostile to all religions and is aggressively atheistic.(2) That wave is passing through the entire civilized world. In China the revolution was as anti-dynastic, as it was anti-Christian and pro-Buddhist, while elsewhere it is said "that Christianity, which alone could come into reckoning

(1) Bury (J.B.): *The Idea of Progress*
288.

(2) Makeev and O'Hara: *Russia* 287—
292.

for every unbiased mind, has quite obviously exhausted its mandate, has for ever lost its influence over the great masses of the working population as in the broadest circle of the intellectual.”⁽¹⁾

The question whether life is worth the living has been answered by the European group of thinkers in the affirmative. To them it admits of no controversy. To Buddha everything depended upon the life. The little lives of men, their sorrows and sufferings were to him a source of painful anxiety. He would, equally with the European savants answer in the affirmative, but unlike them he would postulate two conditions—*first* that the true meaning of life must be understood, and *secondly*, the living must not take stock only of the living, but take long views of the vast ocean of existence in which they are only a tiny atom. This idealism of life has, like a world-wave reverberated through the East and the West and it finds its echo, sometimes faint, sometimes strong, sometimes recognizable, sometimes not, in the modern speculative idealism of Europe.

Reference has already been made to the writings of the great race of the French pre-Revolution and post-Revolution savants. Their influence was by no means transient or local. There are scarcely any points of Buddhist psychology, ethics or metaphysics for which parallelisms cannot be found in the recent speculative literature of Europe. Buddha had asserted that the true measure of morality is not the salvation of the individual but his ethical elevation. To him, as to Fichte and Hegel, progress is the principle of ethics. He completely rejected the individualism of Kant or that of the Christian ethics. But while Fichte and Hegel part company on the goal of human development, neither of them has marched more than a pace with Gautam. Nor has the Western science yet fully grasped the full meaning of the law of cosmic evolution which the great Seer propounded to the assembled Bhikkhus.

(1) Grimm : *Doctrine of Buddha* (Preface) X.

Charles Darwin in his *magnum opus*, on the *Origin of Species*, published in 1859, was the first European biologist to demonstrate the fallacy of the dogma of the fixity of species and the truth of organic evolution. But Buddha had more than two thousand years before him enunciated a wider doctrine, the truth of which science is still striving to test. But European speculation has no doubt that, at any rate within limits, it does certainly explain the development of the universe. In his *Synthetic Philosophy*, Herbert Spencer shows that the laws of change are discoverable which control all phenomena alike, inorganic, biological, psychical and social. This is an extension of the doctrine, for the reception of which the earlier researches of Darwin had paved the way. It extends the doctrine of evolution from the region of biology to the higher plane of social ethics, and in doing so Spencer was merely following the well-beaten path, of which Gautama was the earliest protagonist. He had applied it to the still wider range of cosmic creation. And it was not a happy guess, but the first principle of his inductive philosophy in which each step was tested and its advance measured.

That Buddhism was not oblivious of the grandeur of human efforts is testified to by the pioneering efforts for encouraging the study of medicine, chemistry, physics, astronomy and the fine arts which, with some of the finest efforts of the chisel and the brush still extant, bear eloquent tribute to the æsthetic influence imparted by that religion. By the reduction of idealism to a concrete form, art both expounds and vivifies religion, it gives visual representation to the inward thoughts, hopes and aspirations, longings and desires of man. It is the universal script which needs no learning to read and no grammar to understand.

THE BUDDHIST ART.

To the Buddhist Nature was no longer a myth and a mystery, its forces no longer a puzzle. To him the sorrow and sighs of evanescence had been transfigured into inspiring

and delightful symbols of that eternity which was unchanging and changeless, absolute and not only relative, eternal and intelligible and not only elusive and inscrutable. To the pre-Buddhist, the ideal was a distant phantom—his hand moved, but trembled with the doubts and uncertainty of its objective. To the Buddhist, the phantom became a reality and gave firmness and confidence to his hand which glided with the certainty and confidence of the vision which had penetrated the enigma of the universe. To his forbears, the unity was invisible or but dimly discerned amidst the diversity of Nature. To him, the unity in diversity was the visible soul of creation, for him the unity of all existence was an article of faith, which the Master had again and again demonstrated within the space of his own life.

The advent of Buddhism gave the people new imagery born of a higher conception of the universe and of the human life in relation to it. In extending the horizon of Self to all cosmic relations, in bursting the bond of the narrow frame of the human body and expanding the range of human vision to the boundless empyrean, Buddha created a new world, a new vision which the sculptor and the painter strove to portray in the allegorical edifices, statues, frescoes and paintings which have made Buddhist Art as wide as the universe, as deep as human mind can plumb, and deeper still, as far as human imagination can fathom.

In the age that had dawned before the birth of the Master, Indian art had already reached a high degree of development. The Indians had been pioneers of work in iron and steel; their famous Damascus steel, prized for its toughness and cutting edge, was an article of trade from India to the Persian Gulf, from whence it was exported to Europe. Ezekiel⁽¹⁾ refers to Dan and Javan trading in Tyre with "bright iron cattia and calamus" and other Indian products. The Rig-Ved mentions golden armour and golden chariots as well as decorations of gold and jewels. But at least 2,000 years before the Rig Ved, the genius of the Indian artist had mastered the secret of artistry of which the excavations,

(1) Ch. XXVII.

recently made at Mohenjo-daro in Sindh, are a revelation to those who can extend their imagination to an age five or six thousand years ago, when the civilization and culture of India was markedly in advance of that prevailing in contemporary Babylon and Egypt. The Indians could then turn out artistic ornaments of silver and gold, copper-plated with gold of blue faience, ivory, cornelian, jadsite and multi-colour stones of various kinds. They moulded and made fine statues, busts and animal figures in terracotta and plaster of Paris, carved in marble and stone.⁽¹⁾



(14) Naga Seal from Mohenjo-daro.

(15) Brahmi bull Seal from Mohenjo-daro.

The Buddhist Art is a sermon in stones, a homily in colours—of the community and cohesion of sentient life, of its fellowship and inter-dependence, of its single purpose and of its sweetness, when emancipated from the care and corroding desires. The earliest painter had portrayed the dread and awe of human ignorance. The Buddhist artist delineated the quiet assurance and sublimity of Nature in unison with the highest aspirations of man, born of human knowledge. The cramped vision of the primitive sage, broad-based by the boundless sympathy of the disciples of Gautam, added the flower and fragrance to the inert stone and clay and made their figures vocal of the message of peace and tranquillity with which the Master's voice had filled the air. The music of the spheres, of which the poet had dreamt, became the reverberating note

(1) *Archaeological Notes on Discoveries at Mahenjo-daro (1926-27)* 7.



(16) Indian Museum, Calcutta, Sculptured stone in the Bharhut Gallery.

which filled the cells of the monks and vihars in the grove, to which the believers resorted as to the embrace of one who had emerged from the region of dream-land into the visible plane of reality.

Before the discoveries at Mahenjo-daro, the only trace we had of the Indian art was that of the wood-carvers which in the third century B. C. developed into stone-statuary. But these discoveries show that over two thousand years before that era, Indians had acquired considerable skill in stone-statuary and that they had acquired some proficiency in delineating with some accuracy the outlines of human muscles and arms, while with the softer materials their delineation was admirably accurate. The question whether the Indian sculptor had learnt his craft from Babylon and Egypt or acquired it on his own initiative has not been settled, but the probability would seem to warrant the latter conclusion.

But apart from these examples of primeval statuary recently discovered, we have nothing but an empty show-case to stand for the archaeological finds of the era preceding the reign of Ashoke, for though Buddhism had then reached its summit of popularity, there is no trace of any specimen of the Master's presentment—the reason being the Master had following the vedic and tradition forbidden the perpetuation of his likeness, having declared that on the attainment of his Nirvan he would only live in his Law.⁽¹⁾ This injunction was loyally observed, so that in the earlier sculpture of Buddhistic scenes the presence of the Master was indicated by an empty throne, an umbrella, his *charans* or the footprints, while his birth was indicated by a lotus, his renunciation, by a horse with an empty saddle, and his enlightenment, by the figure of the Pipal tree and his Law, by the Wheel: "There are four places, O Anand," said the Tathagat, "which an honourable worshipper should visit with emotion. Where are these four? They are those where the Tathagat for the first time received illumination and preached and those where for the last time he was

(1) See pp. 529, 530 *post*.

born and died." (1) These places were consecrated by the erection of stupas enclosing a portion of his remains. These were multiplied, (2) as time and circumstances modified the view of the Master's inculcation, and with the accommodation of his doctrine to the exigency of the moment, resort was had to iconographic embellishments to popularize the creed and depict its tenets in pictorial designs which appeal to the multitude. Of these two examples of indigenous art are to be found at Bharhut and Sanchi; of the former, Fergusson remarks—"Such animals, such as elephants, deer and monkeys are better represented there than in any sculpture known in any part of the world; so too are some trees, and the architectural details are cut with an elegance and precision that are very admirable. The human figures too, though very different from our standard of beauty and grace, are truthful to nature, and where grouped together, combine to express the action intended with singular felicity. For an honest purpose like pre-Raphaelite kind of art, there is probably nothing much better to be found elsewhere." (3)

The indigenous art was, however, greatly refined in the second century B. C. by the influence of the Greek sculpture which added a greater naturalness, beauty and proportion to the figures and designs of the native artist; but otherwise its influence upon the Indian art "was purely technical in character and was in no way the spiritual or intellectual force which shaped its ideals and ordered its forms of expression." (4) These improved examples of the Greco-Buddhist art are spoken of as the Gandhar sculptures: Gandhar being the corruption of modern Candahar where the improved art was first practised. Jaatak

(1) *Parinirvan* V.—10-22.

(2) In Burma with a population of 13 millions the pagodas are said to number 4 millions, most of them consigned to time for their preservation, dissipation or decay, with the result that every village presents the appearance of a new settlement in the midst of pagoda ruins—an appalling waste of devotional energy and money which the *Wathaps* would have liked spent upon the alleviation of human suffering. Will the Burmese Buddhists take this hint and divert their pious acts to the endowment of schools, colleges and hospitals, the construction of wells and

the planting of fruit trees and other objects of public utility?

(3) 2, Fergusson: *History of India and Eastern Architecture* (2nd Ed.)—36.

The Tibetan historian of Indian Art ascribes these works to the Devas—*Varanash* (since 1857), a Tibetan Monk, whose real name was Kun-Sujing, born 1675, work composed in 1808, extracted by Basallier, German Tr. by Schiefus, 1869, extracts in (1875) *Indian Antiquary* 101-104.

■ Havell (E. B.): *A History of Indo-Aryan Civilization*—162.

which gave the life-stories of Buddha in his previous births, both as man and animal, gave the Indian sculptor and painter new materials for his imagery, while the conversion of the kings to the new creed gave him the necessary patronage for the exercise of his art, to which the few remains from the inconoclastic vandalism of the Mahomedans still testify.

The most notable survivors of Indian painting are those at Ajanta of which Lady Herringham⁽¹⁾ wrote the following critique: "The outline is in its final state finer, but modulated and realistic, and more often like the calligraphic sweeping-curves of the Chinese and Japanese. The drawing is, on the whole, like mediæval Italian drawing. The artists had a complete command of posture—their knowledge of the types and positions, gestures and beauties of hands is amazing. Many racial types are rendered; the features are often elaborately studied and of high breeding, and one might call it stylistic breeding. In some pictures, considerable impetus of movements of different kinds is well suggested. Some of the schemes of colour-composition are most remarkable and interesting, and there is a great variety. There is really no other portrayal of a dark race by themselves. The quality of the painting varies from sublime to grotesque, from tender and graceful to quite rough and coarse. But most of it has a kind of emphatic, passionate force, a marked technical skill very difficult to suggest in copies done in a slighter medium." To which Mr. Dey adds: "It is impossible for any one who has not seen them with his own eyes, to realise how great and solid the paintings in the caves are; and wonderful is their simplicity and religious fervor." ⁽²⁾

The dome and the technique of that poem in marble, the Tajmahal of Agra, is Buddhist, and not Italian as is sometimes supposed. Mr. Havell writes: "The dome of the Taj is not related to that of Humayun's tomb; it is not an Italian, but a Hindu or Indian type.....Now, if we refer to the orders of Hindu classic architecture, embodied in the Sanskrit technical books—known as the Shilpa-Sastras,

(1) II—*Indian Society*, 14, 18.

(2) Dey: *My Pilgrimage to Ajanta and Bagh* (London 1925) II.


a summary of which is given in Ram Roy's valuable but fragmentary 'Essay on the Architecture of the Hindus, we shall find the connecting links between the dome of the Taj, and its Buddhist prototypes, and see the derivation of its three divisions, or members. The sufficient parts of the dome of a Dravidian temple—*Vimana* are there set forth in minute details.

"Above the *ad'hithana* or base which contains the cell or shrine of the deity, there are three main groups of members. First there is the *griva*, the neck of the dome, which is the drum or polygonal base on which it rests. The *griva* is crowned by a projecting cornice called the *lupa-mula*. Above this, is the *sikhar* or main portion of the dome itself, which is bulbous—shaped like that of the Buddhist dagoba, and springs from a composite lotus-moulding consisting of three parts, two rows of lotus-petals connected by a head-moulding called the *mala Buddh*." (1)

Other noble buildings, *e.g.*, Sher Shah's tomb, are, equally, in conception, as purely Indian as any Buddhist or Hindu temple. (2) Mr. Havell opines that the Buddhist conception dominates all historic monuments in India wrongly classed as belonging to the Indo-Persian model. It reached its summit in the Gupta art, culminating in a normal cycle of evolution. Startling changes in architecture, sculpture and even painting then reveal themselves as developments from crudity to classicism, from balanced serenity to dramatic vigour, tending later, when the message overpowered the medium, to exaggeration and decadence.

Buddhism had enriched not only the Indian art, but its wider view of life and its all-embracing sympathies gave a fresh stimulus to the art of China and Japan which has given to the world some of the finest specimens of its artistic conceptions. As had been already stated, Buddhism was introduced into

(1) Havell (E. B.)—*Indian Architecture*, "Persian" criticized and controverted—24, 25, 26, *contra* Messrs. Fergusson and *Ib.* 155, 156.
 Vincent Smith who describe it as "Indo- (2) *Ib.* 157.



(17) Details of carvings of Amaravati Sculpture in the Government Museum, Madras.

China a few decades before the dawn of the Christian era. The introduction of the new religion carried in its train a new art, of which the specimen in bronze of the year 435 A.D. and stone-sculpture of 457 A.D. following the Kushan type, are in the Muthra Museum, while the Chinese Pagoda is only a transformed Indian stupa of Kanishk's type erected at Peshawar. A fresh stimulus to copying Indian designs was given by the Chinese pilgrims to India, who had taken with them not only the Buddhist books but also their images and relics which moulded the art of Japan, whose aesthetic elaboration of its details has, however, left no external trace of similarity with its Indian prototype.⁽¹⁾

But generally speaking, wherever Buddhism penetrated as a religion, it also carried with it its artistic appanage, and while, therefore, the entire Eastern world has been influenced by the artistic equipment of Buddhism, it has, like the religion itself, been modified and transformed in accordance with the local influences, genius and aptitude of the people.

SYMBOLISM OF BUDDHIST ART.

No reference to Buddhist art would be complete without a reference to its symbolism. It is the pictorial language in which the artist conveys his ideas. Of all Buddhist monuments, the stup stands pre-eminent both in its ubiquity as well as its allegorical meaning. The stup was not invented by the Buddhist. It existed from at least the Vedic times, when the remains of the saint were buried, rather than cremated, it being believed that his body, already pure, did not need purificatory rite of cremation. It was covered with a

(1) But Herr Von le Coq, Director of the Berlin Museum (Indian Section) of Ethnology ascribes the Indian and Chinese images of Buddha as only adaptations of the Greek gods of Apollo and Bacchus and those Buddhist saints as their modified images. He says that his travels throughout Central Asia and

China have convinced him of the close connection between North-Western India and China with Greece from three to five centuries B.C. and adds that in "China the root of all Buddhist-Chinese art is the Greek classical art just as the same Greek art is at the bottom of all our European art."


heap of earth which in course of time was replaced by masonry structures, embellished with elaborate designs, for which inspiration was sought from the tenets of the creed. Thus, the Hindu, the Buddhist, and the Jain stupas soon became carved stories of their faith. As Buddhism became sub-divided into two main sects, each impressed its own individuality upon its distinctive art.

The Vedas discouraged idol-worship, and said: "The vulgar look for their gods in water; men of wider knowledge, in celestial bodies; the ignorant in wood, bricks, or stones; but the wisest man, in the Universal Self." This was carried to the extent that esoteric teaching of the Upanishad was not even reduced to writing; it being held to be too holy for script, but could only be conveyed from Soul to Soul and only realized by profound meditation. Their deep-rooted aversion to idolatry found its way in the Buddhist teaching, with the result that the Master's life and teachings had to be conveyed in an iconic symbolism or hieroglyphs, since the Master had expressly forbade "imaginative drawings painted in figures of men and women," but allowed the Bhikkhus to draw and paint "representations of wreaths and creepers and bone-hooks and cupboards."⁽¹⁾ Consequently, the attainment of Nirvan was symbolized by the figure of a pipal tree with a throne or altar in front, upon which various emblems are placed for worship: "the Wheel of Law" stood for Dharm: and the stupa commemorated the Founder's Nirvan. As previously observed, it is only after Ashoke's time that resort was had to statuary and Buddhist art then became enriched by the stone-images of Buddha, the Bodhisatva, the Devas, Arhats and men carved with the realism of the popular art.

This will be evident if we describe a stupa, typical of each school. In Ceylon the Stupas, called the dagobas, are bell-shaped, though the most approved form is that of a water-bubble surrounded by three umbrellas,—one of the gods, the second of men,—the third of the final deliverance or Nothingness.⁽²⁾

(1) *Kulvagga* VI—3, 2.

(2) *Mahavagga*—175, 190, 193.



(18) Karla (District Poonah) Chattr cave View of interior

Within its petals—the Blessed Ones are depicted as dwelling in paradise. The great dome of the stup represented the sky, while the blue lotus-flower with its inverted petals symbolized the *Hiranya Garbh* or womb of the universe. The group of five columns which rose from the foot of the dome represented the five Jewels,—earth, air, fire, water, and ether. The reliquary which crowned the dome was the relic of the Vedic altar of burnt sacrifice, while the crowning umbrella was the relic of the royal insignia of the race of Kshatriyas. The wheel represented the sun. The arched windows, vaults and domes conveyed the same symbol in another form which later on became represented by a Swastika (卐) or a simple cross (+).

The first object that attracted the notice of man was naturally the Sun, whose diurnal motion through the sky was symbolized by a wheel which at once became the emblem of its disc and one of eternity. The wheel had its other uses. It was the propelling part of a chariot and the primitive sage adopted it as the emblem of motion and progress. In the

Hindu mythology the *chakra* (disc) or wheel of Vishnu was prepared by him from the essence of the Sun-god, Surya.⁽¹⁾ It had twelve spokes which represented the twelve months or the year, and the twelve signs of the zodiac, and to each spoke there was also assigned a deity.⁽²⁾ The Swastika (卐) is only an abbreviated emblem of the solar wheel tyre, and the movement being indicated by the crampons.⁽³⁾ It was later reduced to a cross by the omission of the crampons which represented the parts of the tyre. The wheel, the Swastika and the cross are thus all the same emblems of the sun, and as such they have from the earliest times been the sacred sign of religious auspices. Later on, it acquired the mystery of all symbolisms and was used as an auspicious sign generally. Thus the universal monarch was described as a Chakravarti, to mean the ruler of the globe whose birth-mark was Vishnu's discus visible in his hand, called—Sudarshan Chakra.⁽⁴⁾ In the case of Buddha his birth-mark was transferred to the feet as more akin to the wheels of a vehicle;—the *chakra* marks visible on Buddha's soles being taken to mark his destiny either as Chakravarti or the perfect Buddha. In its figurative sense, the wheel became the symbol of the Buddhist universal law, the “*Dharmachakra*”⁽⁵⁾ or full Compass of the Law; and Buddha himself had ascribed to it mysterious significance. “The wheels,” he said, “are of five kinds, wheels of wood, as in a carriage; circles of gems; the symbolic wheel of Dhamma (righteousness of Law); the four-fold range of postures (standing, walking, sitting, lying); the vehicles of means of success (Sampatti), as for instance, the orbit of a favourable place of residence, the orbit of association with the good, perfect adjustment of one's self, the cycle of merit wrought in the past.”⁽⁶⁾

The lotus, or the water-lily will be found worked into the designs of the base and capitals of frescoes and columns, pillars, arches, window-domes, vaulted roofs and all other structural

(1) Sankhayan—*Grihya Sutra* 11.4.14, 15 S. B. E. 401; *Antiquities of Orissa* 125.

(2) *Ib.*

(3) Simpson; *Buddhist Prayer Wheel*, 105-106.

(4) “*Beautiful wheel*,” “*Auspicious wheel*”.

(5) Rajendralal Mitra—II *Antiquities of Orissa* 125.

(6) *Digha Niky*—4 S. B. E. 254.

designs, as also in paintings, which have been copied all over in Asia and in Europe. As Mr. Havell remarks: "The romantic spirit which inspired the art of Indian Buddhist builders was the spirit of the Gothic cathedrals, and Gothic art was the gift of Indo-Aryan to their craftsmen in the West. In its pristine splendour the chaplet-house of Karle⁽¹⁾ must have been one of the greatest places of worship ever made by the hands of men."

It is easy to follow the journey of the Lotus of the Good Law from India to China, and thence into Korea and Japan: but how the art of Karle and Ajanta passed into Western Asia and thence into Europe, to blossom again in the glorious cathedrals of France, is a fascinating chapter in the world's romance which remains to be written.

BUDDHIST MUSIC.

Music is a secular accomplishment, and has always been a powerful proselytizer and all religions know its value as a necessary adjunct to their religious rituals. This is typified by Saraswati, the goddess of learning depicted as seated on a white lotus with a *vina* (lute) in one hand playing it with another, a book in the third and a necklace of pearls in the fourth. The god Shiv is stated to be the founder of the threefold art of music, dancing and singing. Indra's heaven is filled with the music of Gandharvas who are the singers, who are accompanied by Apsaras, the siren dancers, and the Kinnaras the centaur-performers on musical instruments. The Vedic index shows a very wide variety of musical instruments. In the *Pitak* there is a reference to the two disciples of Gautam Buddh having attended an opera. In the *Mahajanak Jaatak* there occurs a reference to the gift of a band of drum, horn, gong and cymbals to certain great personages before whom

(1) The Buddhist had carved (200 B.C.) or chaplet, house of the Order. The design of this Chaitya-house was followed in the rocks at Karle on the Western Ghats between Bombay and Poona, and in Ajanta. Chaitya-house (Lit. "House of Chaitya")

they were played in a chariot. They sounded "like the noise of the sea." It records Brahmdatt's gift of a miraculous drum to a monk, which, if sounded from one side, scared the foe, while, they became his firm friends if it was sounded from the other. A Buddhist drama, *The silapa ñisaram* (300 A.D.), enacted in the South, mentions the drum, the flute, the *vina* as well as the *yal*; while there are frequent references to chants and songs, both religious and secular, set to music; but they do not differ from the general Hindu music, and the only conclusion they suggest is that while the Buddhists did not discard music, they did not enrich it by any notable developments of their own.

CHAPTER XXI.

BUDDHISM AS THE UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

It is denied that Buddhism is a religion. But whether it is a religion or not depends upon what we understand by that term. It is clear that the term religion is elastic in its import, while even its etymology gives no certain clue to its meaning.⁽¹⁾ In its primary sense, however, it implies belief in a supernatural being or beings controlling the universe and entitled to worship and obedience: in other words, it implies the Creator and the duty which His creatures owe to Him—of reverence and dutiful submission to His authority. So considered, religion is limited to the relationship of man to God. But, since all men owe a similar duty, it becomes necessary to observe certain rules of conduct in the relation of man to man. In its strict sense, such relationship belongs to the domain of ethics, as distinct from morality; but the nexus between the two is so close, and by no means illogical, that it has become an integral part of religion.

Such appear to be the true meaning and limits of religion and there is no reason why it should be used in a wider sense. But so it is, and to a certain extent, justifiably so; since the religionist having assumed a dual duty—one towards God and another towards men *inter se*, it becomes obligatory upon him to link the two by asserting that the second is either a command of God or is inspired by and pleasing to Him and that it must be enforced by suitable sanctions which account for the doctrine of reward and punishment and the consequent creation of heaven and hell.

If we take religion in its pristine purity—as limited to the duty of man to God, we are confronted with the difficulty of understanding the terms we use. Take for instance, the term

(1) Fr. Ety. uncertain—stated to be derived either from L. "*relegere*"—to bind or according to Skeat "*religens*" —fearing the gods opposite to "*negligens*" —negligent; see the subject more fully discussed on pp. 484-486 ante.

"God." What do we know of Him and, unless we know something of and about Him, how can we say what duty we owe to Him? In other words, what we wish to know is whether God is a personal God or is merely a dialectical abstraction, whether He is an entity or a mere hypothesis. In short, we wish to be apprised of some of His attributes, and if these attributes do not define our duty towards Him, we wish to know what that duty is. It is upon these two questions that the world is none the wiser since it began.

It is a well-known experience of those who have to have recourse to medical aid that when the qualified surgeon pronounces the case as incurable, the quack appears on the scene and promises to relieve the trouble by his nostrums and patent pills. Such is unfortunately the case in religion. Man finds himself confronted with the wide universe. He naturally wishes to know who made it, or otherwise, how did it come into existence? The universe is a mute *enigma*. It provides him with no solution. But Man must know. His mind is restless: his curiosity insatiable. He cannot rest contented with the unsatisfactory answer that he cannot know. He gives vent to his insatiable curiosity and failing to find any other solution, he finds some solace in the assurances of the knave or the fool, probably the latter, who appears upon the scene and promises to hold the master-key to the great riddle of the universe, or, in order to satisfy his own curiosity or gratify his vanity, passes muster a fable which he passes as inspired or revealed; but, for which he offers no proof other than his own asseveration. The inquirer has no counter-theory of his own. His mind is a blank—of knowledge he has none, and he is consequently fain to accept what he cannot disprove, except by the obvious inference of reason. But human reason is limited, while the universe is unlimited. His mind is even less than ■ mustard seed to fathom the infinite span of Nature. What is he to do? In his helplessness he accepts what he can get. But what he does get is precious little; for even guesses have their limits; and the vaster the subject, the less scope is there for plausible guesses.

But a truthful man will make no guesses. If he does not know, he will say so. Such was Buddha. He was born in an age when the Brahmanical doctrine of Brahman held the field. As already observed, it did not go beyond the statement that "He exists" (1) and that "He is eternal, all-knowing, absolutely self-sufficient, ever-pure, intelligent, and full of pure knowledge and absolute bliss." (2) The Christian conception of God was, as has already been seen, (3) inherited from the Jews who believed Him to be a super-man, something like a King or the "Pater Familias," with the Jews as His chosen people. "So God created man in his own image." (4) But the truth is that the Jews had created God in their own image. And this tradition Jesus adopted and repeated. He did not reveal a single fact about Him, of whom he professed to be the incarnation. The later apostles and saints have added nothing to our knowledge of God. They have merely idealized him as the embodiment of perfection. The Vedantist asserted that He was *Nirgun*, that is without any attributes at all, since attributes are definitive, whereas He is undefinable. The Christian reached the same result by defining His attributes in a cluster of superlatives, both positive and negative. Thus Lessius: "From the fact that God is infinite in His essence, it follows that He Himself is necessarily infinite in every kind of perfection that belongs to Him, namely, the greatness, power, wisdom, holiness, etc. These perfections are in Him by a single and most simple form, which is absolutely infinite and unlimited. For they are not real properties proceeding from the essence, but are the Divine self-subsisting essence itself, and consequently, are a simple form of the Divinity which can be comprehended by us only imperfectly."

"By reason of this simplicity, God is infinitely perfect and more excellent than if He possessed all the perfections in different forms, compounded and united with each other;

(1) *Katha. Up.* VI-13; *Chand. Up.*; *Shankar Faith. Up.* 244; *Anandgiri Faith. Up.* 252.

(2) *Shankar F.S.* 25.

(3) *See* Ch. XVIII ante.

(4) *Genesis* I-27; cf. *Ib.* I-26.

for it is infinitely more perfect and more excellent and more sublime to possess all perfections by a single form than to possess them by different forms. For these different forms are really limited to their own species. Hence, it follows that they could not constitute the Divinity or be the Deity itself. But that form which in its supreme simplicity contains all perfections, is necessarily limitless and infinite. It is being by itself, *esse*, and consequently is the Divinity itself."⁽¹⁾ But the definition of God by ascribing him positive attributes has its limitations and superlative is itself a relative term and is limited by human comprehension. Consequently, an effort to describe Him by what He is not is held to be more hopeful. So Denis ventures upon a negative definition. He says: "Raising our language higher we say: 'God is neither soul nor intelligence, He has neither imagination, nor opinion nor reason, nor understanding; He is neither word nor thought, and He can be neither named nor understood, He is neither number nor order, neither greatness nor smallness, neither equality nor inequality, neither similitude nor dissemblance. He is not motionless, not in motion, nor at rest. He has no power, nor is He power or light. He does not live, He is not life, He is neither essence, nor eternity, nor time. There is not perception in Him.

'He is not science, truth, empiric wisdom; He is neither one, nor divinity nor goodness. He is nothing of what is not, nothing of what is. No being can understand Him as He is, nor does He know any of the things that are as it is. There is to Him neither word nor name nor science; He is neither darkness nor light, neither error nor truth.' Concerning Him, we must neither make absolute affirmation, nor absolute negation; and by affirming or denying the things that are inferior to Him, we do not thereby affirm or deny Him, because that perfect and unique Cause of beings surpasses all affirmations, and He who is wholly independent and superior to all beings, surpasses all our negations."⁽²⁾

(1) Lessius: *The Names of God*.

Poissin's "*Vedanta Vindicated*" p. 109.

(2) *Mystic Theology* V cited in Rev. J.

St. Thomas Aquinas felt that the definition of God, by a mere assemblage of negations, would hardly carry conviction. So he attempts to formulate an affirmative definition. "I answer," he says "that true affirmative propositions can be formed about God. To prove this we must know that in every true affirmative proposition the predicate and the subject signify the same thing in reality, and signify something else in idea. It is manifest that man and whiteness have the same subject, and differ in idea; for the idea of man is one thing, and whiteness is another. The same applies when I say, Man is an animal; the being 'Man' is truly an animal, for they exist in the same subject (*Supposito*)—both the sensible nature by reason of which he is called animal, and the rational nature by reason of which he is called man; hence this predicate and subject are in the same subject (*Supposito*), but differ in idea.

"To this diversity of idea corresponds the plurality of predicate and subject, while the intellect signifies the identity of thing by the composition itself. God, however, as considered in Himself, is altogether one and simple; still, our intellect knows Him by different conceptions; so, it cannot see Him, as He is in Himself. Nevertheless, although it understands Him under different conceptions, it knows that one and the same simple object corresponds to its conceptions. Therefore, the plurality of predicate and subject represents the plurality of idea, and the intellect represents the unity by composition."—An example of scholastic ratiocination.

God was the subject of anxious inquiry by the Greek philosophers, but they too abandoned the quest with the words, which the wisest of men gave expression to, on the eve of his death: "And now you to live and I to die; but which of us is going to a better land is unknown to every one except the gods."⁽¹⁾

If, therefore, the definition of religion is limited to its primary conception, what have we got? In the light of

(1) Plato: *Death of Socrates*.

pure reason, we see Him not. We have a vague sense of the presence of an all-pervading power; but whether it is cosmic energy, subject to its own immutable laws, or something beyond, we know not, and probably we shall never know. Such is then the result of Reason. And yet beyond Reason what have we got? There remains then the Faith. Now Faith without reason is as risky as reason without Faith. In the one case, it may lead to the installation of error in the place of truth; in the other case, the truth reached is relative and not absolute. And this is all the distinction between atheism and agnosticism, a distinction which detractors of that religion consciously or unconsciously seem too often to forget.

Buddh knew that so far as regards the knowledge of God, all he could do was to correct the prevailing notions. His contribution to the knowledge of God was, therefore, necessarily negative and iconoclastic, but corrective. He ridiculed the Brahmans who professed to know all about God. He despised their method of reaching Him by immolation. These were the two cardinal tenets of Hinduism and he opposed them both, in a language at once emphatic and clear.

Now as the Hindu concept of Divinity has never been improved upon and as it finds a place in later Christianity, it follows that in so far as Buddh's contribution concerns the main theme of religion, he had purged the human mind of a serious error which he who runs can see, but which continues to be perpetrated and perpetuated by the combined effect of early training and its indoctrination by pious parents and the professional priesthood. It is the faith instilled into the young minds of the pupil by persons in authority and at the most impressionable period of life.

If the League of Nations or some other authority charged with the duty of protecting children were to save them from intellectual corruption by making the Nations to agree that religious instruction into any denominational creed shall be deferred till after they had passed the years of nonage, one or

two generations would suffice to stamp out the pernicious errors of all religions and restore the youth to what is pure and true in them.

This would be an essay to instruct the world in a universal religion. It may be asked where does such a religion exist? That Buddhism is such a religion is admitted even by its opponents. For if we turn from God to Man, the question that has puzzled the philosopher and the religionist alike is—Man, his past, his future and his conduct. These words comprise all that is to be said about the relationship of Man to God and of Man to Man. And it is in this connexion that the religions of the world disclose the widest divergences. These questions raise those which relate to the man's soul, his original sin, his destiny, the questions of salvation and damnation and those of Heaven and Hell.

But as all religions postulate the existence of God, but differ on His form and attributes, so here, though all religions agree in establishing a nexus of man with God through the medium of soul of which the body is said to be only a tabernacle—a temporary abiding place, still they differ upon what it means and comprises,—whether it is something distinct from the body or is merely another name for consciousness, whether it is a reality or a mere longing, and all else that that longing implies. It is upon these human problems that Buddhism has shown marked originality and its founder has concentrated his supreme effort.

We have already seen what Buddhism has got to say on the subject. That may or may not command universal acceptance. But what has commanded universal acceptance, and indeed universal acclamation is its social morality. That remains a unique feature of Buddhistic ethics, and it is the prototype of Christian ethics which has in no way improved upon it. On the other hand, in its adaptation to Jewish theology it has suffered some deterioration. Apart, however, from its local variations, the fact remains that the Buddhist ethics is unapproachably the highest that the mind of man can

conceive and it is this which makes Buddhism the cornerstone of a world-religion.

Believers of dogmatic Christianity, of course, deny that Buddhism is a religion; and there can be no doubt that considered in the light of those that have come to be regarded as the basic foundations of all religions, Buddhism will not stand the test.

For instance, all religions regard belief in a personal God as a cardinal part of their faith. In its pristine purity, Buddhism did not postulate the existence of such God. But while all religions postulate the existence of one God, they do not all admit that that God is the God of all religions. For example, the God of the Jews was Jehovah, but He was only in later years admitted to be the God of the universe. So the worshippers of Allah would indignantly repudiate that their God was the Brahm of the Hindu religion. It would thus seem that while all the religions seem to agree upon one God and that a personal God, they repudiate the suggestion that that God is common to all religions.

Again, while all religions, such as Hinduism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam base their creed on Revelation, each claims the revelation as special to its own religion. In other words, every religion asserts its right to paramoury on the ground of its special and exclusive Revelation—a Revelation made by a God who specially favoured that religion and imparted to it a secret which He has withheld from all others.

Buddhism alone never made such a claim. On the other hand, it claims to be the sumtotal of knowledge which has come to us by our own mental processes.

As such, its doctrine is purely ethical and its appeal is made direct to the seat of reason. Consequently, it is a religion in one sense though not in the other. The Christians, who dread its invasion upon their own faith—the super-natural character of which its historical study seriously undermines—have attacked its tenets root and branch, oblivious of the fact that in attacking them they were sapping the foundation

of their own creed. How can Buddhism be a religion, it ■ argued: "It refused to admit the existence of a personal Creator, or of man's dependence on a higher Power. It denied any eternal soul or ego in man. It acknowledged no external, supernatural revelation. It had no priesthood, no real clergy, no real prayer, no real worship. It had no true idea of sin, or of the need of pardon, and it condemned man to suffer the consequences of his own sinful acts without hope or help from any Saviour or Redeemer, and indeed from any being but himself."⁽¹⁾ "It is clear then that tried by such a criterion as this, early Buddhism could not claim to be a religion."⁽²⁾

The Hindu will say the same. He will argue that Buddhist ran full tilt at all the cherished tenets of his religion, the supremacy of the Brahmans, the infallibility of their scriptures, the worship of idols and the observance of caste and in the special sense in which religion is understood to connote a sectarian dogma, the followers of other religions will join with the Christian and the Hindu in denouncing it as no religion at all.

But this is its especial merit. It embodies the basic truths of all religions, and is free from their superstitious dogmas. It is this which is causing flutter in the orthodox dovecotes. "It is, indeed, one of the strange phenomena of the present day, that even educated people who call themselves Christians are apt to fall into raptures over the precepts of Buddhism, attracted by the bright jewels which its admirers delight in culling out of its moral code, and in displaying ostentatiously, while keeping out of sight all its dark spots, all its trivialities and senseless repetitions, not to speak of all those evidences of deep corruption, beneath a whitened surface, all those in significant precepts and prohibitions in its books of discipline, which indeed no Christian could soil his lips by uttering."⁽³⁾

(1) M. Williams: *Buddhism* pp. 539, 540.

(2) *Ib.* p. 539.

(3) *Ib.* pp. 541-543.

But the same authority does not deny "that much of the teaching in the sermon on the Mount and in other parts of the Gospel-narrative is based on previously current moral teaching which Buddhism was the first to introduce to the world 500 years before Christ."⁽¹⁾ and he admits "that Buddhism conferred many other benefits on the millions inhabiting most populous parts of Asia. It introduced education and culture; it encouraged literature and art; it promoted physical, moral, and intellectual progress up to a certain point; it proclaimed peace, good-will and brotherhood among men; it deprecated war between nation and nation; it avowed sympathy with social liberty and freedom; it gave back much independence to women; it preached purity in thought, word and deed (though only for the accumulation of merit); it taught self-denial without self-torture, it inculcated generosity, charity, tolerance, love, self-sacrifice, and benevolence, even towards the inferior animals; it advocated respect for life and compassion towards all creatures; it forbade avarice and the hoarding of money; and from its declaration that a man's future depended on his present acts and condition, it did good service for a time in preventing stagnation, stimulating exertion, promoting good works of all kinds, and elevating the character of humanity.

"Then again, when it spread to outlying countries, it assumed the character of a religion, it taught the existence of unseen worlds; it permitted the offering of prayers to Maitreya and other supposed personal saviours, it inculcated faith and trust in these celestial beings, which operated as good motives in the hearts of many, while the hope of being born in higher conditions of life, and the desire to acquire merit by reverential acts, led to the development of devotional services, which had much in common with those performed in Christian countries. Nay, it must even be admitted that many Buddhists in the present day are deeply imbued with religious feelings, and in no part of the world are the outward manifestations of religion—such as temples and sacred objects

(1) M. Williams : *Buddhism* p. 543.

of all kinds—so conspicuous as in modern Buddhistic countries.”⁽¹⁾

The writer then, referring to the fact that Buddhism was a kind of introduction to Christianity, says “that Buddhism has never claimed to be an exclusive system. It has never aimed at taking the place of other religions. On the contrary it tolerates all, and a Buddhist considers that he may be at the same time a Hindu, a Confucianist, a Taoist, a Shintoist, and even strange to say, a Christian.”⁽²⁾

This is exactly why Buddhism must be classed as a world-religion. It possesses none of the bigotry, nothing of the exclusiveness of the sectarian creeds. It is tolerant of all creeds, but only intolerant of their superstition and absurd dogmas, and offers a faith enlightened by reason, and a convenient formula for uniting all intellectual forces on the ground of a common idealism.

(1) M. Williams: *Buddhism* pp. 551, 552.

(2) *Ib.* p. 552.

CHAPTER XXII

THE EPILOGUE.

The rise of Buddhism marks a golden era in the history of the East. That era has long since passed away, never to return; but its spirit is still a land-mark in the history of human civilization and culture and its contribution can never be overrated.

The history of Buddhism is the history of a great world-movement, the full effect of which has not yet been seen. Though, over twenty-five centuries have elapsed since its founder closed his eyes, the freshness and vigour of his teachings have ever grown like the all-spreading banyan tree, under which the great world-mentor taught the first elements of his creed.

Though in India his garlands are withered, his trumpets mute, yet in the world beyond, his voice is the voice of the celestial, his call—the call of the only Saviour to which half the world responds.

A thousand years before his time, a remarkable system of philosophic thought was first conceived by the great seers of India. They held the Universe centred in Brahm—the Supreme Spirit of the Universe. They saw with their mental vision that all that human eyes could see was a mere delusion and that there was no substratum in the world-phenomena. The Brahm created the Universe. The worlds innumerable came into existence, lived their day and died; and this cycle of eternal change followed a concrete shape, eventually only to merge into the Brahm from which they emanated. The Great Universe was, then, nothing more than the sport of Brahm which could not be described otherwise than by the one word "Asmi"—"I AM". The Soul of Brahm pervaded all beings which originated from and then merged into Him.

Now since all visible world is impermanent and ever-changing, that change must be subject to the law of causation,

The Brahm was eternal and immutable, the world was transient and human life, of all lives, transitory; while its happiness and misery, pleasures and pains seemed wholly fortuitous. But behind and beneath its seeming inequalities, there was the backing of the Divine Spirit. How could it, then, be voted as unjust? The injustice was only apparent, but not real. To the short-sighted vision of the narrow on-looker, the inequalities seemed great and inexplicable. But to the great seers who comprehended the Universe as a whole, this life was only a short flicker which man could see, though it was only a link in the great chain of causation; it was the product of a concatenation of causes in which the mind and matter presented a visible 'dualism-- the one representing a spark of the Great Soul and the other an obstacle in its passage to its appointed goal. In the great chain of causation, the previous life was the immediate cause of the present, as the present would be that of the next. The actions of man were the determinants of his lives, the vicissitudes of which were formed and shaped by his own deeds: It was the combined law of Karm and re-incarnation.

Logically, then, man was the master of his own destiny. This view gave colour to the entire ethical doctrine of virtue and vice--of good and evil. As a man soweth, so shall he reap.

The pure metaphysics of this ancient creed did not remain long unchallenged or unsullied. It was the simple seed from which grew a vast system of Indian Philosophy. Side by side with the dissenters, there grew up a priestly class who professed to have solved the great riddle of the Universe.

They held, it is true, that the law of Karm was universal, but by no means inexorable. There were means of circumventing it. They were found in the law of devotion to Brahm, of which what better proof was available than that found in sacrifice and penance, self-sacrifice and austerity? It was a short-cut to salvation. An unwieldy ritual out-grew the philosophic view of cosmogony, the fine fountain of which was polluted by the selfish assumptions of the priest-craft, who became mediators between the man and his Creator. One ritualism led to another, till all life became involved in the en-

compassing thralldom of religion. Society was sub-divided into castes, which was claimed to have been made by divine appointment. When once the mind is enslaved, it is not difficult to imprison the body. Moreover, superstition has possessed special attraction for the proletariat everywhere, and it becomes a fetish when it is allied to ignorance. The priests in India regarded it as a sacrilege that their scriptures should be read by other than the twice-born and practical difficulties interfered with the latter acquiring sufficient literacy to understand them.

The priests had thus the practical monopoly of learning, literacy and knowledge of the unspoken tongue in which their sacred scriptures were written. It would have been expecting too much of any monopolist that he should use his power otherwise than as it was used by the priest-craft. They placed themselves in a class apart—even above the gods. They divided all society into four castes, not including the outcasts who were the aborigines, and society so divided soon became self-centred and narrow, and its members cultivated the spirit of jealousy and spite towards those of the other castes. A religion such as this could not, of course, think of proselytism. It was one in which communalism became the dominant shibboleth. The duties of the various castes to each other and their common subjection to the Brahmins were meticulously set out. They were impressed upon the vulgar with the sanctity of divine ordinance. The entire society was now bound in the fine meshes of ritualism and religion. It had no social obligations and its members were free to prey upon one another, which they did by the Kings levying wars upon their neighbours, and the people amusing themselves by killing, maiming or otherwise disturbing the peace of others, while high-ways were rendered as insecure as those who maintained them.

It was at such time and amongst such people, that Gautam Buddha was born. He had to combat the overweening supremacy of the Brahmins, overcome the organized union of self-interested clericals, maintain the sanctity of the intellect against the parti-

sans of credulity, restore the social order and retrieve it from the rule of tooth and claw, and, if possible, make saints out of such age-long and hardened sinners.

Buddh dealt with three aspects of Brahmanisra. He studied their cosmogony, examined their *a priori* method, and was able to pick and choose for himself as much of it as appeared to him to appeal to his inductive reasoning. Gautam's method was throughout inductive, the reverse of the Brahman deliverance. He preached to a people in an age, who put religion above science: his preachings are as fresh to-day, when men have begun to put science above religion. His own line of ratiocination bore the same relation to that of the Brahmans, as the method of Aristotle bore to that of Plato. Both followed the inductive line of reasoning; and both proceeded along the well-beaten track of proved and ascertained facts. As such, turning to the Vedantic theory of the creation, Gautam, while prepared to admit the presence of a Supreme Power, was, still far from conceding the existence of the Supreme Deity.

Nor was he prepared to accede to the teaching that the world was an emanation of that deity and that it was a mere illusion. His own view was that it was impossible to say how far the external world was a reality, and how far a phantom, since our senses furnished no trustworthy criterion of truth; and our mind was unable to act independently of the senses. It is owing to our inability to determine what share these internal and external conditions take in producing the impressions of external world that we cannot absolutely predicate as to the actual state of nature apparent to our senses. Our knowledge being then relative, we cannot predicate anything about the absolute character of Nature. Nevertheless, conceding to our mental infirmity a real existence of visible nature, the one thing presented to our mind is a succession of impermanent forms, and as exhibiting an orderly series of universes, worlds, and beings, arising, growing and disappearing in strict conformity with a primordial law.

As consistent with this law, Buddh accepted the law of Karm and that of re-incarnation. But this doctrine postulated

the existence of the individual soul of which *Buddh* found no cogent evidence. Nevertheless, since he had to postulate the continuance of a *nerus* to bridge the gulf that divided the two lives, he had, in the end, to work on the hypothesis—as if the soul continued to preserve its individuality, despite the destruction of its body.

But *Buddh* regarded these questions as secondary and he was not prepared to close with his opponents. He regarded such inquiry as wholly beyond the orbit of human mind, certainly beyond the ordinary human mind.

However, making full use of these current, though unproved, metaphysical dogmas, he reared thereon his grand fabric of ethics, directed against class-privilege and caste-inequalities, while he restored to man the dignity of his reason by decrying the insane sacrifice of lives for the purpose of securing salvation, which, he said, must be earned and cannot be purchased.

He knew that the cumulative human sufferings owed their origin to the promptings of evil desires: he had, therefore, to make men curb and control their predispositions. To enable them to do so, they must acquire the habit of governing their will. By the combined mastery of his desires and will, man could be made to be a helper to his fellow-men. But what should be his ideal? The Brahmins had presented to the devout the bliss and beatitude of Paradise. His own ideal was *Nirvan*—that mental satisfaction and its resultant pleasure which arises from the knowledge that one has done one's duty. The *Nirvan* so attained is conditional and transitory. Its permanency can only be assured by a life well-spent with no craving for future life left in a mind completely emancipated from the feeling of Egoism. *Buddh* believed, that so long as men were not indoctrinated into that feeling, they would be unable to forego the dominating force of evil desires, apart from which there was no evidence for the existence of an Ego separated from its physical basis.

The eternal *Nirvan* being, then the ultimate aim and goal of life, it was the duty of man to make the most of it and so

obviate the possibility of future births. Human body, like all matter, was a suitable mechanism for the purification of the mind. When it became immaculate from the sordid desires and wants of life, the influence and grip of evil thoughts and evil deeds, when the sage was willing as cheerfully to die as he was willing to live, with no lingering regret that his life was coming to a close, meeting death with a complete self-detachment and with abounding hope of eternity, he had attained Nirvan which would survive the disintegration of death.

Knowledge of two things was needed to assure man of this bliss—the cause of life and its sufferings and the remedy for ending them. These were formulated in the two great principles—the four sacred truths and the middle path. The truths concern the sorrow, and the path, its extinction by right thought and action, which, while avoiding ritualism on the one hand, avoids sensualism on the other.

These are not mere vague admonitions, but have been worked out in great details. The Path is divided into eight sub-heads and is to be completed in four stages in which ten fetters or errors or evils of the mind are to be conquered and removed. The details are technical: but their objective is to make a thorough cleansing of the mind by removing therefrom the delusion of self and bring under control the bodily passions and the desire for self-indulgence.

That the Master's clarion-call for social purity had the desired result, is abundantly clear from the fact that the ethical foundation of his religion has become the basis of another great religion, which shares with Buddhism the distinction of spiritual mentorship of three quarters of the world.

It is also a fact, worthy of note, that even the Hindu conception of cosmogony has materially shaped the world-thought on the subject. It would seem as if the stream of spiritual thought flowed from India to Persia and through that country to Egypt and thence to the smaller nations of Asia Minor, including Palestine, from whence it received a fresh stimulus and

in later years vivified the thought of all thinking Europe. The history of ancient Egypt probably goes back further than the history of any people in the world. According to Draper, traces of the pre-historic, pre-monumental life of Egypt, are still preserved in the relics of its language and the well-known principles ■ its religion. Of the former, many of the words are referrible to Indo-Germanic roots,—an indication that the country at an early period must have been conquered from its indigenous African possessors by intrusive expeditions from Asia, and this is supported by the remarkable principles of Egyptian religion. The races of central Asia had at a very early time attained to the psychical stage of monotheism. Africa is only now emerging from the basest fetichism; the negro priest is still the sorcerer and rain-maker. The Egyptian religion, as is well known, provided for the vulgar a suitable worship of complex idolatry; but, for those emancipated from superstition, it offered true and even conceptions. The co-existence of these apparent incompatibilities in the same faith seems incapable of any other explanation than that of an amalgamation of two distinct systems, just as occurred again many ages subsequently under Ptolemy Soter.⁽¹⁾

Herodotus describes the Egyptian conception of the Soul as an emanation from a particle of the universal Soul, which in a less degree animates all animals and plants and even inorganic things. They upheld the doctrine of Karm and its consequential transmigrations through even animals for purification. ⁽¹⁾ Greece which had always looked up to Egypt for its spiritual inspiration appears to have carried it across the sea; and Greece broadcasted it to all nations along the Mediterranean coast, and, further inland, to countries such as Macedonia and Asia Minor and thence to the rest of the civilized world. Of course, the primitive philosophical elements from which we start are examined by each recipient, who shapes them in accordance with his own proclivity, and thus they pass from hand to hand and in course of time become the common heritage of mankind.

⁽¹⁾ *Intellectual Development of Europe*, —81, 82, ⁽²⁾ *Ib.* 91, 92.

The net result of Buddhism in the East was to enthrone rationalism in place of ritualism and sacerdotal authority. It prepared and popularized a new code of morals, which was as revolutionary of the established order as it was thorough and penetrating in its effect upon every individual life, from that of the king down to that of the peasant. It broke down the dead wall of privilege and superstition and cast abroad the seeds of religious truth, the identity of which is in some cases lost in the variations produced by the soil and atmosphere.

One thing is certain. Buddhism, as such, scarcely made any headway in Europe, though its principles and elaborate rituals have left their impress upon the Western faith. During the six centuries which followed the death of its Founder, several attempts were made to bring the near West under its sway; but Judaism appears to have presented an impenetrable barrier to its outward progress in that direction.

That religion stood committed to a personal God, and religious monarchism as regards His relation to the world. The only people, He had chosen to be His own, were the Jews. Their conception of the Universe was thus one which called for a supreme effort of faith to endorse it; and this was readily supplied by Christianity, the founder of which had come to fulfil the law, not to combat it.

His teachings gave Judaism a wider vogue and with the enthusiasm born of a neophyte, the principles of the new creed—composite of Judaism, Hellenism and Paganism—obtained a wider currency in which the cardinal doctrine of divine monarchism was transformed into a divine patriarchism and captured the heart of the lay men. The essential features of the first 1,600 years of Christianity may then be summed up to be—(a) Belief in the fatherhood of God; (b) His manifestation in the person of Jesus; and (c) the resurrection and eternal life to those who so believed in Him. The question of human soul was left to be determined by the polemics of religion; but the prevailing doctrine, till the age of Reformation, was one of pure materialism, it being maintained that the soul was simply a second body “a

transparent and lucid figure in the perfect form of a man" (1) "The angel in the Last Judgment was constantly represented weighing the souls in a literal balance, while devils clinging to the scales endeavoured to disturb the equilibrium." (2) It is only a little before the Reformation that the pantheistic doctrine of an all-pervading spirit, which "sleeps in the stone, dreams in the animal, and wakes in the man," (3) brought in its train a purer conception of the soul. But these were the faint rumblings of a gathering storm led by the mystic writings ascribed to Dionysius and Areopagiti and other Christian pantheists, which swept over Europe and destroyed the power of the monarchist theology with its thorough anthropocentrism and unqualified materialism as regards human soul, and its destiny in a material heaven, purgatory or the Inferno. The Reformation was only one phase of the religious renaissance which swept away the crude conceptions of the old dogma and gave to the old words a new meaning in consonance with the altered views of the age.

The ensuing centuries are marked by the growing strength of rationalism, a tendency to rationalize the religion, to reconcile the old with the new, and to associate new images with the old, to refine, purify and spiritualize its dogmas and revise and reform its expressions. "Ecclesiastical power throughout Europe has been everywhere weakened, and weakened in each nation, in proportion to its intellectual progress. If we were to judge the present position of Christianity by the tests of ecclesiastical history, if we were to measure it by the orthodox zeal of the great doctors of the past, we might well look upon its prospects with the deepest despondency and alarm. The spirit of the Fathers has incontestably faded." (4) But out of the ashes of the old dogma, there has sprung into existence a system of exalted ethics in which the old bickerings and strife, the old rivalries and jealousies, between one religion and another, will disappear and man settle down to the service of man as the highest *Dhamma*, and the purest virtue as the noblest sacrifice that he can make to insure his happiness in the life that is, and the life to be.

(1) Pertunian: *De Anima* Ch. VII; quoted in *Lecky* 340.

(2) *Ib.*

(3) Schelling.

(4) *Lecky*—186.

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
A		Ashoke,—Contd.	
Ajanta—		His edicts	203—205
Fresco scenes at	... 87	His death	... 205
Ajat Shatru, son and successor		Date of his inscriptions	... 47
of Bimbeshwar	... 50	Ashvagbosh, author of <i>Buddh</i>	
Patron of Buddhism	... 50	<i>Charit</i>	... 33, 184
Pataliputra (modern Patna)		Legendary Life borrowed	
founded by Ajat Shatru	... 50	from <i>Lalit Vistar</i>	... 191
Alphabet—		Atta—Buddhist word for soul	80
Its introduction into India	47	Avanti—Kingdom of King	
Anand,—faithful disciple of		Pajjot	... 44
Buddh	... 86, 136	Ujjain, its capital	... 44
Anath Pindik—Prasannajit's		B	
minister	... 131	Beal—on the origin of Shakyas	
Anaximenes—Greek Philosopher	71	—See also Bibliography	... 81
Anga, present Bhagalpur and		Benares—	
Monghyr Districts	... 49	In Buddha's time	77, 101
Arad Kalap—a dualist teacher		Buddha's visit to	101, 113
of Sankhya Philosophy	... 100	Bhalika—	
Gautam's teacher, could not		Becomes Buddha's follower	113
satisfy him	... 101	Bibliography	... xviii—xxiii
His teaching	100, 101	Bimbeshwar,—Monarch of	
Arhat—A Buddhist Saint—See		Magadh	... 49
also Glossary	... 224	Persuades Buddha to abandon	
Who are Arhats, meaning of		asceticism	... 102
Arhat	... 235	Patron of Buddhism	124, 125
Multiplication of Arhats	... 228	Bimbisar—	
Art—(Buddhist)	522—529	See Bimbeshwar	... 49
Its symbolism	529—533	Bodhisatva Maitreya, Buddha-	
Ashoke—King of Magadh		to-be	... 39
Proclaims Buddhism State-		Status open to all under	
religion	... 202	Mahayan	... ■
His enthusiasm for Buddhism	203		

	PAGE		PAGE
B—Contd.		His visit to Uruvela ...	118
Bodhi Tree—		Instructs disciple preachers	118
See <i>Mahabodhi</i> .		His Conversion of robbers	119, 122
Brahm Sahampati—		His plan of missionary	
persuades Buddha to		work	122, 123
preach	110—112	His visit to Gaya ...	123
Buddh—		How he converted	
And the Licchavis	... 51	Kaashyap	123, 124
His ancestry ...	77, 80, 81	His visit to Rajgrah ...	124
His genealogy 81	Converts King Bimbeshwar	124
The land of his birth	... 77	Causes panic on Magadh by	
His mother's dream	... 82	conversions	... 125
His education	... 83	Explains doctrine's progres-	
His marriage83—86	sive stages to Magadh	
His appearance	... 88—90	villagers	125, 126
Whether Statues and images		His first visit to Koshal ...	131
show aural deformity	... 89	His return home	133—137
His Home life	... 91	Routine of life and work	
His Life after Marriage	... 91	after his return from	
Pensive mind	... 91	Kapilvastu	136—147
Birth of a Son	... 93	Closing years of his life ...	158
His Renunciation	...94—96	His illness and death	159—163
His seven years of Preparation		Three questions of his iden-	
(Chapter V).		tity, birth and death ans-	
His mortification and re-		wered	164—176
turn to normal life	103, 104	His character	176—182
His Enlightenment, its		Objections to comparison to	
meaning ...	105—106	Jesus, answered	178—181
Whether of Mongolian ex-		The secret of his success ...	180
traction	51, 52	Ranked as a god after death	183
His Reflections before En-		His precepts	374—391
lightenment	... 104	Pearls of wisdom	... 377
Twelve years of Ministry ...	109	His parables ...	391—412
His hesitation to preach		Parallelism between Christ's	
doctrine	109—112	and Buddha's legendary	
Decides to preach ...	112	life	435—440
Visits Benares to meet five		Parallelism between dis-	
Bhikkhus	... 113	courses of Christ and	441—443
His method of preaching	118—119		

PAGE	PAGE
Buddh—Contd.	Buddhism—Contd.
Justified in not going too deep into Metaphysics ... 472	Revival of ... 229
The Secret doctrine—Ch. XV. 349—373	Reasons for schism 199—207
View of God and Soul and Nirvan 349—353, 369—373	Ashoke's enthusiasm for 203, 208
Conception of immortality of Soul ... 369	System not reduced to treatise, reasons for ... 196
Buddhghosh , commentary on Buddh's dialogues 144, 303, 368	Extension of ... 213
Buddhism—	Formula of doctrine 286, 287
And Hinduism. (See under <i>Hinduism</i>).	View about God 274—281
Materials available for the Life of Buddh 32—33	Existence and nature of Soul 286—287
Life of Buddh (See <i>Buddh</i>).	Chain of Causation 286, 287, 308
Buddhist method of teaching 33—34	In Tibet 249—252, 262
Development of 39—41	In China 255—263
India before (See <i>India</i>). 43—52	In Japan ... 263
Language of ... 47—49	In Burma 264—266
Faiths and Philosophies at the time of (Ch. III). 53—76	In Java ... 266
How superior to Vedantism and Jainism ... 38	In Ceylon ... 266—268
Protestantism of the East ... 30	Position of women under 268—273, 511—512
Wide-spread conversion to 126	Four noble truths of ... 339
Koshal converted to ... 126	How far indebted to Jainism 420—422
Prof. Monier Williams' comparison ■ Christianity to, criticized 126, 127, 453—457	And Jainism—Similarity and difference ... 422
Opposition to 148—151	Its influence on Eastern European thought 423—426
Its influence on Christianity 446, 447	And Christianity—tenets compared 426, 430, 440—442
Its influence on Islam ... 448	Compared and contrasted with Christianity—(Ch. XVIII) 450—462
Sub-division into numerous sects 198	And Modern Thought.—Ch. XIX. 463—498
Leading features of schools of 199	Huxley on its vitality ... 464
	Lewes on its philosophy ... 464
	Its being religion, modern objections as to, answered 465—471
	Buddhist Psychology 490—49

PAGE

PAGE

D—Contd.

H—Contd.

Doctrine—See under *Buddhism*.

Dwar Pandit—gate-keeper ... 513

E

Enlightenment.—See under *Buddh*.

Epicurus ... 75

His philosophy ... 75

Compared to the Buddhist
Doctrine ... 75, 76

G

Ganges—

Buddh's ferry over ... 113

Ferry toll abolished 113—114

Gaya—

Kashyap's Brahman monas-
tery at ... 123

Treated as camp by Buddh 147

Temple at Buddh Gaya ... 449

Girivra] See *Rajgrah*.

God—See under *Buddhism*,
Its doctrine.

Gopi—Wife of Buddh, her other
name Yashodhara ... 85

Marriage ... 85

Gotamaka.—See *Mundak sevak*.

Gridhra Kut.—See *Vulture peak*.

H

Happiness, quest of, Eastern
and Western view 21, 22

Heraclitus, his life and philo-
sophy ... 72

Compared with the Buddhist
Doctrine 72, 76

Hinduism—

Occupation of the Aryan
Immigrants ... 2

Their division and origin of
caste ... 2, 3

Hindus—new and old ... 3, 4

Whether Brahman born or
made, Buddh's view ... 121

Their three stages of de-
velopment ... 4

The Brahmans ... ■

The Upanishads 5, 55—84

Six schools of Hindu
philosophy ... 6

Puranas ... 6, 7

Tantras ... ■

Hindu theology ... 7

Its passage from Animism
to Monotheism ... 9

Dharm or duty ... 3

Growth of Hinduism, how 3

Two epochs of growth ... 4

Sanatan Dharm, routine of
its follower ... 9

Correlation of Hinduism
and Buddhism ... 10

Buddhist attack on Hindu
ritualism ... 10

Contemporary Greek
thought ... 16—18

Its contrast with
Buddhism ... 18

Buddhism and Vedantism ■

Charvak's atheism ... 28, 29

Human Race—(Also see *Hinduism*.)

Its division ... 1

Place of Hindus ... 1

	PAGE		PAGE
Human Race—Contd.		J	
Age of Aryan Immigration into India	2	Jivvan or Jit's wild, a beautiful garden called after prince Jit	131
Hindus—		Prasananjit receives Buḍḍh in	131
Table of inter-relation of races	1	K	
Three types of people at close of Aryan incursions	2	Kapil—	
Huen Tsiang—		See <i>Saṅkhya</i> .	
His account of the meeting place of Buḍḍh and his family	132	Karm—	
Account of Nalanḍ and Taxilla Universities ...	514	And re-incarnation	334—338
Date of Buḍḍh's death ...	170	Kashyap—	
I		Buḍḍh's faithful disciple ...	124
Illustrations—		His presence at his death ...	171
Descriptive Notes xxiv—xxxi		Presence at the first Council	197
India (in Buḍḍh's time)—		His conversion	123
History of, before 7th Cen- tury B. C. obscure ...	49	Kasika ,—harlot convert to Buḍḍhism	119
Urban life scanty in ...	44	Kaundinya , a disciple Bhikkhu who proffered his service to Buḍḍh	143
Village system	44	Koshal—	
Slavery as such unknown ...	45	Buḍḍh's first visit	131
Literature generally memorised	47	Brahman opposition how broken	132
India before Buḍḍhism (Ch. II)	43—52	Krishna Gotami , bewails death of child, consoled by Buḍḍh ...	156
The Ganges plain described	43	L	
Its sovereignty at Buḍḍh's time	43, 44	Lalit Vistara—	
Kingdom of Koushal, its extent	43, 44	Describes life of Buḍḍh ...	32
When business begins in ...	122	Its incidents inscribed and engraved	32
Isipatan—See Sarnath		Describes legendary life of Buḍḍh	184
		Description of Gautam's, con- ception	■
		Fresco scenes of Gautam's life depicted in	86
		Swayamvar before Gautam's marriage	84—85

	PAGE		PAGE
L—Contd.		M—Contd.	
Language (in Buddh's time)		Mahabharat—A Hindu Puran	
Prakrit in vogue	48, 49	Account of Pandava's Swa-	
Pali not necessarily spoken		yamvar	■
language ...	48, 49	Describes Kapil's doctrine ...	84
Legends—(See also <i>Mythology</i>).		Mahabodhi tree—	
Legendary life of Buddh		At Gaya under which Buddh	
(Ch. VIII) 184—191		obtained enlightenment ...	106
Maya's dream	185	History of the tree ...	267
Omens	186	Branch plained in Ceylon ...	267
The birth	187	A new Tree marks the spot,	
Presentation of infant to		see descriptive note No. 4	267
gods	187	Return visit of Buddh to fig	
Putting to school ...	187	tree	134
Youth and Marriage ...	188	Mahabodhi Societies in several	
Leaving home, penance ...	188	countries	229
Fight with Mar	189—190	Mahaparinirvan Sutta, gives	
Buddhhood	190	account of Buddh's closing	
Parallelism of, with Chris-		period	33
tian gospels	435—442	Mahavagga	
Lenormant on the origin of the		Mental attitude of Buddh	
Shakyas	81	described in	109
Licchavi, name of a clan ...	51	Description of Buddh's	
Their History	50, 51	miracles	456
Described	51	Essays on rules and conduct	
Was Buddh a, theory exa-		of monks	138, 140
mined and refuted	51, 52	Mahendra, Ashoke's son, first	
		missionary to Ceylon ...	202
M		Mallas of Kushinagar cremate	
Magadh—		Buddh's body	170
Powerful Kingdom in Buddh's		Mar—	
time	44	Buddhist Satan	109, 112
Rajgrah, its capital ...	44	His temptation of Buddh ...	112
Bimbeshwar, King of ...	44	Buddh's conquest over him	
Mahavir—			112, 190
Founder of Jainism ...	148	Maya—	
His life	148	Mother of Buddh ...	82
His teaching founded on		Was she a myth ...	165
Parasnath's	148		

PAGE	PAGE
Philosophy (Greek)—Contd.	B
Plato, his school of thought 73	Rahul (a)—
Platonic doctrine 73, 74	Son of Buddha 93, 137
Aristotle, founder of Peripatetic school 74, 75	Rajgrah.—See Magadh.
Epicurus, founder of Epicurian school 75, 76	Buddh's camp ... 147
Thales ... 71	Religion—
Pythagoras ... 71	Definition of 466—468, 535, 539
Xenophon ... 71	Buddhism as 464, 472, 539, 540
Parmenides ... 71	Rudrak.—See under Nihilism.
Zeno, 'founder of school of Stoics 71, 72, 75	■
Philosophy (Hindu)—	Sabha , distinguished preacher 119
Puranik Trinity ... 7	Saman —See Gautam or Buddha.
Bhagvat Puran best known 7	Sambodhi enlightenment. See under Buddha.
Pantras, dialogues between Shiv and his consort ... 7	Sangh (meaning see Glossary).
Stage of Hindu thought at Gautam's birth ... 4	Buddh appointed no successor 192
Puranas, described ... 6, 7	His reasons 193, 194, 196
Bhakti or love of God ... 6	Rules of Brotherhood—(Ch. XI) 239—273
Kapil, founder of Sankhya school ... 19	Marriage , = disqualification ... 239—241
Vyas, founder of Vedant school ... 19	Status of lay brethren ... 241
Patanjali, founder of Yoga school ... ■	Subsequent gradations 243, 244
Plato—	Initiation and ceremonies 244—245
His doctrine ... 73, 74	Course of instruction ... 246
Prasannajit—	Discipline and rules of conduct 247—249
King of Koushal ... 50	Four stages 339—342
Patron of Buddhism ... 50	The Commandments 344—345
Pythagorast ... 71	Seven Jewels of reflection 345—346
His philosophy compared with the Buddhist doctrine 71, 76	Value of Monasticism ... 486
22	Sangh , a powerful organization in Buddha's time ... 243
	Sanjati , disciple.—
	His miracles ... 125
	Sankhya—
	Philosophy ... 64—68
	Its relation to Buddhism ... 70

	PAGE		PAGE
S—Contd.		T	
Sariputra, distinguished disciple ...	125	Tapas—See <i>Yoge</i> .	
Sarnath—(See descriptive note no. 9.)		Tapasya—	
Satdharpundarik, Text book contains esoteric principles ...	419	Becomes Buddha's follower	113
Savathi, capital of Koshal ...	127	Trikavyangika a woman ascetic of Mathura accepts new faith ...	119
Script—		Tripitaks, canonical books of	
Sanskrit, borrowed from Semitic tribe ...	47	Hinayan sect ...	34
Kharoshtri or Kashgar alphabet ...	47	Their size, Spence Hardy's view	40
Shakyas—		R. David's view	40
And the Licchavis ...	51	Pitaks of other countries...	40, 41
Mass conversion and destruction of	152—153	Thales ...	71
Their conscription to Buddhism ...	150	U	
Whether of Scythian or Turanian origin ...	52	Universities (Buddhist) and education	512—516
Meaning of the term	44	Upanishads—	
Name of a clan of Kharis ...	44	Their philosophy	55—64
Shampak, a Shakya, disobeys proclamation and fights ...	152	Svasamvett Upanishad, its philosophy materialistic ...	29
Shampak's stup, contains Buddha's relics given to ...	152	Prevailing doctrine pantheistic ...	59
Shankar—		Chhandogya, theory of transmigration	59—61
His philosophy	61—63	Urville—	
Shiladitya, general council ...	214	Selected abode of Gautam ...	99
Shuddhodhan—		Selection of, shows Buddha lover of nature ...	177
Father of Gautam Buddha	80	Buddha's going to preach at ...	118
His life ...	80	V	
Sinhahann—grandfather of Buddha ...	80	Vamshas or Vatsas, kingdom of ...	
Sunparant, a Buddhist missionary ...	155	Koushambi, its capital ...	44
		Vedant, points of agreement and difference <i>inter se</i> 20, 21, ■	

PAGE

PAGE

V—Contd.

W

Vedas—

Their age	54
Their doctrine	5
The six schools described...	6
Buddhism and the Sankhya system	28
Upanishads	58
Mantras, subdivision of Vedas	4
Brahmana, subdivision of Vedas	5
Brahm, vedic spirit of universe	58
Meaning of Brahmin Vedas	58
Maya, an illusion	58

Venuban—Favourite resort of

Buddh	50
--------------	----

Vihars—Monasteries, univer-

sities	177
---------------	-----

Vaishali, Buddh's illness near

159

Vishakha, rich widow, devoted

disciple of Savatthi	127
Her eight boons	127—131

Vulture peak—

Hill, favourite resort of Buddh	50
--	----

Wheel—

Of the law described	532
Its symbolism	166, 531, 532

X

Xenophon—And the Eleatics...

71

Y

Yashodhara, wife of Buddh	85, 134, 136
Her marriage	85
Birth of a son	93
Life after the great renunciation	136
Her conversion by Buddh	136, 270

■

Zeno, Greek philosopher, founder of the school of Stoics

75

Zoroaster or Zarathushtra, ■

great teacher of Persia	11
Author of Zend-Avesta	12, 13
Doctrine of resurrection in Zend-Avesta	12, 13
Ahura Mazda, Persian Sun-god	12
Ahriman, prince of darkness, Persian	12

